

# *Association of American Colleges Bulletin*

---

VOLUME XXXII

MAY, 1946

NUMBER 2

---

Edited by

GUY E. SNAVELY

Executive Director of the Association

BERTHA TUMA

Editorial Assistant

Published by the

*Association of American Colleges*

N. Queen St. and McGovern Ave., Lancaster, Pa.

*Editorial Offices*

19 West 44th Street, New York 18, N. Y.

March, May, October, December

Annual Subscription, \$3.00

Entered as second class matter, March 15, 1926, at the post office at  
Lancaster, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section  
1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized May 13, 1922.

## OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR 1946-47

*President:* Charles J. Turek, President, Macalester College.

*Vice-President:* Edmund E. Day, President, Cornell University.

*Treasurer:* LeRoy E. Kimball, Vice-Chancellor, New York University.

*Executive Director:* Guy E. Snavely.

—*Executive Director Emeritus:* Robert L. Kelly, Claremont, California.

*Board of Directors:* (Additional Members) David D. Jones, President, Bennett College; Kenneth I. Brown, President, Denison University; Vincent J. Flynn, President, College of St. Thomas; Mildred McAfee Horton, President, Wellesley College.

---

## STANDING COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

**COMMISSION ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND ACADEMIC TENURE:** Chancellor William P. Tolley, Syracuse University, *Chairman*; Chancellor S. P. Capen, University of Buffalo; President Francis E. Corkery, Gonzaga University; Dean William C. De Vane, Yale University; President Benjamin E. Mays, Morehouse College; President John W. Nason, Swarthmore College; President Bessie C. Randolph, Hollins College; Dean A. S. Raubenheimer, University of Southern California; President Samuel N. Stevens, Grinnell College; President George R. Stuart, Jr., Birmingham-Southern College.

**COMMISSION ON THE ARTS:** Chancellor R. H. Fitzgerald, University of Pittsburgh, *Chairman*; President Helen D. Bragdon, Lake Erie College; Eric T. Clarke, Metropolitan Opera Association; President J. R. Cunningham, Davidson College; President Carter Davidson, Union College; President Laurence M. Gould, Carleton College; Sister M. Helene, Siena Heights College; Barclay Leathem, Western Reserve University; President Raymond R. Paty, University of Alabama; President J. E. Walters, Alfred University; President Herman B. Wells, Indiana University.

**COMMISSION ON CHRISTIAN HIGHER EDUCATION:** President Irwin J. Lubbers, Hope College, *Chairman*; President Carter Davidson, Union College; President Harlie L. Smith, William Woods College; President Edward V. Stanford, Augustinian College; President Rees E. Tulloss, Wittenberg College; Professor Thomas S. Bowdern, Creighton University; E. Fay Campbell, Board of Christian Education, Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.; John L. Davis, Board of Higher Education, Disciples of Christ; Donald Faulkner, Board of Education, Northern Baptist Convention; Chancellor William P. Tolley, Syracuse University; President E. A. Fitzpatrick, Mount Mary College; President C. M. Granskou, St. Olaf College; President A. R. Keppel, Catawba College; President Benjamin E. Mays, Morehouse College; Chancellor B. F. Schwartz, Nebraska Wesleyan University; Gould Wickey, *Secretary-Treasurer*.

**COMMISSION ON CITIZENSHIP:** President Philip C. Nash, University of Toledo, *Chairman*; President E. S. Briggs, Phillips University; President E. B. Bunn, Loyola College; President Mary Ashby Cheek, Rockford College; President Rufus E. Clement, Atlanta University; President Robert C. Clothier, Rutgers University; President Arthur Coons, Occidental College; Trustee Samuel R. Harrell, University of Pennsylvania; President Robert L. Johnson, Temple University; Trustee Garfield D. Merner, Illinois Wesleyan

University; President Hubert Searcy, Huntingdon College; President Charles J. Smith, Roanoke College; Dean Arthur T. Vanderbilt, New York University.

COMMITTEE ON INSURANCE AND ANNUITIES: Dean Mark Ingraham, University of Wisconsin, *Chairman*; President Victor L. Butterfield, Wesleyan University; President Everett N. Case, Colgate University; Executive Director Kathryn McHale, American Association of University Women; Dean Francis L. Meade, Niagara University; Vice-President Rainard B. Robbins, Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association.

COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL RELATIONS: President B. F. Ashe, University of Miami, *Chairman*; Paul J. Braisted, Hazen Foundation; Chancellor B. M. Cherrington, University of Denver; Professor Broderick Cohen, Hunter College; Dean Margaret T. Corwin, New Jersey College for Women; President John S. Dickey, Dartmouth College; President Virgil M. Hancher, State University of Iowa; President Francis S. Hutchins, Berea College; President Ralph C. Hutchison, Lafayette College; Professor S. E. Leavitt, University of North Carolina; Rector P. J. McCormick, Catholic University of America.

COMMISSION ON LIBERAL EDUCATION: President James P. Baxter, III, Williams College, *Chairman*; President Gordon K. Chalmers, Kenyon College; President Harry D. Gideonse, Brooklyn College; President Paul Swain Havens, Wilson College; President Mordecai W. Johnson, Howard University; Dean T. R. McConnell, University of Minnesota; President F. A. Middlebush, University of Missouri; President Nathan M. Pusey, Lawrence College; President George N. Shuster, Hunter College; Allan P. Farrell, Assistant Editor, *America*; President Marjorie Nicolson, Phi Beta Kappa; Director Waldo G. Leland, American Council of Learned Societies; Director Donald R. Young, Social Science Research Council.

COMMISSION ON PUBLIC RELATIONS: President Raymond Walters, University of Cincinnati, *Chairman*; Arthur Brandon, University of Michigan; President Francis P. Gaines, Washington and Lee University; President Daniel L. Marsh, Boston University; President Cloyd H. Marvin, George Washington University; W. Emerson Reek, Colgate University; President E. V. Stanford, Augustinian College; President Levering Tyson, Muhlenberg College; E. D. Whittlesey, University of Denver.

COMMISSION ON TEACHER EDUCATION: President W. W. Whitehouse, Albion College, *Chairman*; Sister Annette, College of St. Catherine; President Theodore A. Distler, Franklin and Marshall College; Ernest V. Hollis, U. S. Office of Education; President Fred G. Holloway, Western Maryland College; President L. H. Hubbard, Texas State College for Women; President Howard F. Lowry, College of Wooster; President William J. Millor, University of Detroit; Dean Margaret S. Morriss, Pembroke College; President Harry K. Newburn, University of Oregon; Dean Charles H. Thompson, Howard University; President John Davis Williams, Marshall College.

REPRESENTATIVES ON AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION: President Goodrich C. White, Emory University (one year); President Francis P. Gaines, Washington and Lee University (two years); President James P. Baxter, III, Williams College (three years).

COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATIONS: The President, *ex officio*, The Vice-President, *ex officio*, The Executive Director, *ex officio*.

## CONTENTS

Editorial Notes .....	165
Arts Program .....	170
National Commission on Christian Higher Education .....	172
Our Responsibilities to Victory, <i>Edmund E. Day</i> .....	173
The American Army University at Shrivenham, England, <i>William P. Buttler</i> and <i>Cullen B. Gosnell</i> .....	176
Better Teacher Preparation, <i>Karl W. Bigelow</i> .....	184
Pharmacy Education, <i>Kelcy Kern</i> .....	194
Higher Technological Education in England, <i>H. Lowery</i> .....	197
The Administration of Public Higher Education in a Democracy, <i>Marten ten Hoor</i> .....	202
Public Affairs in Assembly Programs, <i>Myron F. Wicke</i> .....	216
The Meaning of Scholarship for Today, <i>Ordway Tead</i> .....	220
Cherishing and Creating the Christian and Democratic Tradition in a Living World Society, <i>Kenneth I. Brown</i> .....	232
Should We Have Compulsory Training, <i>Russell N. Squire</i> .....	239
Prejudice and the Study of American Literature, <i>John C. Hepler</i> .....	248
Benefit Plans for Non-Academic Employees, <i>Rainard B. Robbins</i> .....	255
Millivolt Learning, <i>Charles E. Packard</i> .....	274
The University President in Court, <i>M. M. Chambers</i> .....	280
Education, <i>Winston Churchill</i> .....	287
Greetings, <i>Guy E. Snavelly</i> .....	291
The Navy Plans the Peacetime Education of Naval Officers, <i>Edward V. Stanford</i> .....	293
Report of the National Commission on Christian Higher Education, <i>Irwin J. Lubbers</i> .....	297
Wellesley's New Curriculum .....	299
National Roster of Prospective College Teachers .....	302
National Interfraternity Conference Committee on Cooperation with Colleges and Universities .....	305
A Short History of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, <i>James E. McCain</i> .....	307
Book Reviews:	
High Schools for Tomorrow, <i>Helen M. Hosp</i> .....	308
Democratic Education, <i>Gilbert W. Mead</i> .....	310
Toward Improving Ph.D. Programs, <i>William Allison Shimer</i> .....	312
Among the Colleges .....	314
New College Presidents .....	316

The BULLETIN is published four times a year—in March, May, October and December. Its emphasis is on description and exposition, not primarily on criticism or controversy. The March issue regularly carries the Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association. Leaders in the college world contribute to every issue.

**Annual Subscription Rates:** Regular \$3.00; to members of Association colleges special rates are offered: individual subscriptions, \$1.00; ten or more club subscriptions, mailed in one package for distribution at the college, 50 cents each. Address the Association of American Colleges, 19 West 44th Street, New York 18, N. Y.



## EDITORIAL NOTES

**R**EPORTS INDICATE THAT MEMBER COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES are doing their utmost to meet the demands of returning veterans of World War II. Efforts are being made to discover institutions that can obtain additional housing facilities that will permit a further increase of enrolments in the summer term and the fall semester. In cooperation with the New York State Association of Secondary School Principals, we have on file the Report of the present situation in many of our member institutions. The Veterans Administration is accumulating similar information through a questionnaire to all colleges and professional schools, with a distribution of this information to be made to counselling centers. Eager veterans should be able to obtain admission to reputable institutions in the immediate future.

**S**OME INSTITUTIONS ARE ABLE TO INCREASE greatly their enrolment by scheduling lecture and recitation classes in the afternoons and evenings, a policy which has been generally avoided in the prewar days. It has always seemed a great waste of utilization of fine college and university buildings by scheduling only laboratory classes during the afternoon hours while the regular recitation and lecture rooms are mostly vacant after one or two o'clock.

**M**ANY COLLEGES ARE OVERCOMING the shortage of teachers by adding temporarily to the regular teaching schedules of the present staff members, with a corresponding increase in salary. Others are finding success in their efforts to discover in the local communities competent persons who can teach on a part-time basis.

**I**N THESE DAYS WHEN SALARIES AND WAGES ARE BEING RAISED on all sides, particularly in the manufacturing areas where strikes have recently been settled, college administrators will certainly want to do their best to find ways and means to have the income of their professional and non-professional colleagues raised as much as possible. It would seem logical also to grant raises in rank and pay to faculty members returning

from war service, at least to the extent that they might have expected if they had remained on the faculty during the war.

**I**N ORDER TO AID VETERANS in making plans for entering college upon their release from service another request has come for college catalogs. The publications should be addressed to: Information and Education Section, United States Forces, China Theater, APO 971, San Francisco, California. Attention: Education Branch.

**C**OLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS will find some excellent suggestions in the conclusions reached in the Bigelow article on "Better Teaching Preparation" to be found in this issue of the *BULLETIN*. Of particular interest is the suggestion that faculty members make a point of improving relationships with teachers in their respective departments in the high schools. It will certainly be mutually advantageous to both the high schools and the colleges if contact with the high school faculty is not to be considered primarily the function of the college professor of education.

**T**HE NEW AMERICAN COLLEGE by John A. Sexson and John W. Harbeson presents every phase of an experiment carried on in California in the rearrangement of the timing of education. The authors advocate a program of a six-year grammar school, a four-year high school and a four-year public junior college as helping to solve the problem of better articulation of secondary and college instruction. From this book, teachers, school administrators and other interested persons will derive an understanding of the reorganization of school systems and find concrete guidance as to how to put the new plan into effect. Published by Harper and Brothers, New York, New York.

**T**HE S. S. HUEBNER FOUNDATION FOR INSURANCE EDUCATION announces that graduate fellowships and scholarships will be offered at the University of Pennsylvania for the spring, summer and fall terms in 1946. The aim of these fellowships and scholarships is to aid teachers and prospective teachers to secure preparation at the graduate level for insurance teaching and research. Further information may be obtained from Dr.

David McCahan, The S. S. Huebener Foundation for Insurance Education, N. E. Corner, 36th and Walnut Streets, Philadelphia 4, Pennsylvania.

**A**ERICAN FOREIGN POLICY by Edwin Borchard presents an analysis of the main trends of American foreign policy from 1776 to the adoption of the United Nations Charter. This authoritative summary is for citizens, teachers, students and public officials who wish to know what American foreign policy has been in order to be better informed and qualified to discuss and evaluate the current problems of international relations. Published by the National Foundation Press, 46th Street and Sunset Avenue, Indianapolis 7, Indiana.

**PHI LAMBDA THETA** announces two awards of \$400.00 each, to be granted on or before August 15, 1946, for significant research studies in education. An unpublished study on any aspect of the professional problem and contributions of women either in education or in some other field, may be presented. Inquiries should be addressed to Bess Goodykoontz, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

**FOR US THE LIVING** by John J. Mahoney is essentially the content of the author's course of study on "School and Society" at Boston University. It is a particularly valuable book for teachers and prospective teachers and for anyone who is interested in the improvement of citizenship through better education. Published by Harper and Brothers, New York, New York.

**STATE PROGRAMS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF TEACHER EDUCATION** by Charles E. Prall is concerned with tested working methods and the results of experiments which translate educational theory into practice. It is one of the reports on the activities of the Commission on Teacher Education of the American Council on Education. Published by American Council on Education, Washington 6, D. C.

**ROBERT COLLEGE, ISTANBUL**, has openings for assistant professors in the following fields: English, Commerce, Civil Engineering (Structural Engineering) and Civil Engineering

(Hydraulic Engineering). The college is in need of instructors in English, General Science, Mathematics, Physical Education, Civil Engineering and Mathematics (Structural Engineering), Mechanical Engineering, Electrical Engineering and Physics. Further information may be obtained from the Near East College Association, 50 West 50th Street, New York 20, New York.

**VICE-PRESIDENT RAINARD B. ROBBINS**, of Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, with full knowledge and approval of other officers and trustees, is offering his personal services as a pension counsellor to commercial and governmental organizations and also to officers of colleges and universities. He has established an office at 19 West 44th Street, New York 18, New York, from which to carry on this activity. Mr. Robbins continues with the TIAA as a Vice-President and Trustee, mainly in a consultative capacity. Mr. Robbins' independent work for cooperating institutions and others will usually have to do with operations and studies, either more detailed than the institutions wish to request of TIAA, or of wider range than seems appropriate for it, or of an extent that is obviously beyond its facilities. Because of his exceptional experience and knowledge, he can be helpful in this way to many organizations.

**THE NATION'S SCHOOLS PUBLISHING CO., INC.**, announces the appointment of Harold W. Herman as managing editor of *College and University Business*, a new magazine devoted to the business aspects of higher education, to appear in April, 1946.

**WALTER J. McNAMARA** has been released from the United States Navy to return to International Business Machines Corporation in the Department of Education as Consultant in Educational Tests and Measurements. His services will also be available to educational institutions for professional consultation on problems and procedures in test scoring and educational evaluation.

**AT THE FIFTY-FIRST ANNUAL MEETING** of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, held in Chicago, March 25-30, 1946, the following insitutions of higher education were added to the accredited list:

Anderson College, Anderson, Indiana  
 Aquinas College, Grand Rapids, Michigan  
 Davis and Elkins College, Elkins, West Virginia  
 National College of Education, Evanston, Illinois  
 Roosevelt College of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois  
 The Saint Paul Seminary, Saint Paul, Minnesota  
 College of Saint Teresa, Kansas City, Missouri

Central YMCA College of Chicago, which has ceased operations, was removed from the accredited list. The official list of accredited institutions, now numbering 318, will appear in the July number of the North Central Association *Quarterly*.

A BOOK that ought to be found in every college and university library is Dr. Harold Garnet Black's new 110,000-word biographical study called *The True Woodrow Wilson, Crusader for Democracy* (Revell, \$3.00), work on which was begun twenty years ago. Colonel House, Wilson's close personal friend and political adviser, who read an early draft of the manuscript, wrote the author: "No life of Wilson yet written has pleased me more. Your estimate of the man will be accepted and will place him on a higher pedestal than that of those who write with more fulsome praise of him." The late President Roosevelt in his Introduction declared the biography to be "worthy not only of reading but of preserving for our children and our children's children." Its elaborate Index will make it a most valuable reference work. The book is scholarly, factual, authoritative, unprejudiced, and—above all—most readable. Dr. Black is a professional teacher and the author of a half dozen other volumes and numerous articles on educational and religious subjects.

## ARTS PROGRAM

**E**RNST BACON, composer-pianist, gave a "one-man show" in The New York Times Hall on March 3. Assisted by students of Syracuse University, Mr. Bacon presented a program of compositions for voice, violin, chorus and duo-piano before a select audience which displayed keen interest in his works. Mr. Bacon is director of the school of music at Syracuse University.

Fritz Jahoda, pianist and member of the music faculty at Sarah Lawrence College, presented an interesting concert program on March 31 in Jordan Hall, Boston.

Maurice Eisenberg, cellist, recently returned from a tour of the British Isles and the Continent of Europe. While in London, Mr. Eisenberg appeared twice within two weeks as guest artist with the London Symphony Orchestra in the famous Royal Albert Hall.

Samuel Dushkin, violinist, presented his annual Town Hall recital on March 12 and is making plans for a Carnegie Hall concert next season.

Katherine Bacon, pianist, gave a second recital of the season in New York's Town Hall on April 6; the first being given on November 3. It was a pleasure to hear this accomplished artist again.

Dr. Peter Gray, biologist, has been made acting head of the department of biology, University of Pittsburgh. We congratulate Dr. Gray on his promotion.

George Rickey, head of the art department at Muhlenberg College, was recently released from three and one half years' service in the Army Air Corps. Under the auspices of the Arts Program, Mr. Rickey toured in Kentucky and Tennessee during February.

Harry Gottlieb's fifth one-man show opened at the ACA Gallery in New York on March 31. Although well known for his work in silk screen, the present showing of 29 pieces completed



within the past year indicates Mr. Gottlieb's return to landscape painting as his major interest. Your reporter particularly liked *The Trout Stream, Below the Bridge, Red Pigs* and *Long Island Ducks*. Mr. Gottlieb knows how to combine action and nature to a remarkable degree.

In recognition of the Tenth Anniversary of the Arts Program a luncheon was held at the Hotel Roosevelt, April 8, which included present and former staff members and "Visitors" living near New York. Dr. Snively paid tribute to Eric Clarke, now directing musical activities in the American occupied area in Germany, for his outstanding contribution to liberal arts education as first director of the Arts Program. Within the ten-year period 1,555 visits have been arranged by the Arts Program.

## NATIONAL COMMISSION ON CHRISTIAN HIGHER EDUCATION

**T**HE TOTAL MEMBERSHIP of colleges and universities in the work of the Commission is 438, of which 393 have already paid their dues for 1946. This is the largest percentage of paid-up membership at this date in the history of the Commission.

**A**PPPLICATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP were received from Berry College, Mount Berry, Georgia; Central College, Conway, Arkansas; Viterbo College, La Crosse, Wisconsin; and Union College, Schenectady, New York. They were approved.

**A**T ITS RECENT MEETING in Chicago, the Commission voted favorably on the following resolutions:

1. That the present relationship of the National Commission on Christian Higher Education to and with the Association of American Colleges be continued.
2. That we look with favor upon a joint program with the Council of Church Boards of Education, and that a special Committee from the Commission meet with a similar committee from the Council to discuss items of program, budget and personnel. (The Committee to confer with the Council is composed of I. J. Lubbers, Carter Davidson, and Edward Stanford.)

## OUR RESPONSIBILITIES TO VICTORY

EDMUND E. DAY

PRESIDENT, CORNELL UNIVERSITY

**WE HAVE** now lived long enough with victory in World War II to ascertain certain of its implications. One of the things we must all have come to see is that overwhelming success in a great war is bound to involve a peace-loving nation in highly complex and far-reaching consequences.

The simplest part of victory is the spontaneous, immediate celebration. In this phase, joy can be unconfined. Affirmations of triumph are quite in order. The defeat and humiliation of the enemy can be acclaimed. The invincibility of our own arms can be hailed. Crowds shout, bands play. The mood is one of profound relaxation, of unbounded jubilation.

With thinking people this phase soon gives way to sober reflection upon the costs at which victory has been achieved.

Wars grow more and more destructive. They now take their toll of noncombatants and combatants alike. They end in a vast expanse of disease, famine, rubble and disorder. They inflict losses which are so devastating as to threaten the very existence of civilization; a fear of possible later disaster can cast its shadow even in a time of overwhelming victory.

But, happily, for the time being the threats of further aggression for us have been removed. Our way of life has been preserved. Our material possessions, our social institutions, our pride of country, our liberties, our hopes and aspirations, all these remain for the country as a whole essentially intact. Our sense of gratitude to the host of men and women, many out of this very company, who served and sacrificed that we might continue to enjoy these great privileges, knows no bounds. Thanksgiving, profound and enduring thanksgiving, constitutes a phase of victory that we must never neglect.

But there is much more to victory than this. Already we can see that victory of the sort we have won has to be spelled out in complex and far-reaching terms. For, overwhelming success in

NOTE: Address delivered at the Victory luncheon of the National Interfraternity Conference, November 24, 1945, in New York.

the exercise of military power now leaves a trail of physical ruin, economic disruption, and political chaos, of which the victor himself becomes in part the victim. The time has long since passed in which any liberty-loving people can think of victory in terms of spoil. That much we might have learned from World War I. To find the fruits of this latest victory of ours we must look not in the direction of national privilege but rather in the direction of national responsibility.

The great allies who fashioned the victory we now celebrate have acquired a world domination, the like of which modern man has never seen. The combined might of the Big Three is for the time being subject to no possible challenge. What use of this tremendous ascendancy are these great powers going to make that all mankind may more fully enjoy the blessings of prosperity, of justice and of peace? No question in all human history has been more momentous.

This occasion affords no opportunity for even a quick probing of this query. I should like, however, to make brief observations along one important line.

The most serious threat America faces at this moment is to be found in the spiritual lassitude, almost inevitable following the kind of supreme effort we made in winning this war. No political leaders were ever more mistaken than were the Axis dictators when they predicted that the democracies could not and would not fight. Once aroused, free men have a fighting capacity slaves, however fanatical, can never match. We can all take great pride in the marvelous spirit with which our people finally brought their latent powers to bear.

But now that victory has been achieved, there is this overwhelming urge to quit, to get back home, to return to accustomed peacetime pursuits. We are all weary of war and all it connotes.

This same spirit prevailing twenty-odd years ago led us into policies of shortsighted and foolish political isolationism. Apparently we shall not precisely make that mistake again. We have already committed ourselves to the full support of the United Nations Organization. But if our commitment remains exclusively at the level of political organization, it will ultimately fail. It is the full strength of all the American people that must be bent to the task of bringing health, prosperity, justice and peace to all this one-world of ours.

This is no sentimental idealism. It is practical politics. For the people have long since come to learn that no nation, however powerful, can possibly live unto itself. If we of America seek only our own comfort and peace, we shall find ourselves again some day living in death and destruction. If history teaches us anything at all, it is that man can never escape from three fundamental responsibilities—responsibilities to himself, to his fellows, to his God. We live in a time when these fundamental responsibilities must be thought through once more and in terms of a new kind of world; the sweat of our latest victory leaves us with no real alternative.

On this occasion, when we meet here representing the college fraternities of the country, I like to think that the ideals for which we stand have a significant bearing upon the necessities of this postwar situation, for the ideals of the college fraternity are the ideals of common fellowship, of sympathetic association, of mutual helpfulness, of upright living, of unselfish service.

These are ideals not easily attained. We know that at times we have fallen seriously short of them. But they remain ideals worth striving for with all the resources of mind and body and character we can possibly marshal.

In so doing we can minister to the most pressing needs of our time, for in a wider sense of brotherhood, a more pervasive spirit of good will, a greater readiness to sacrifice for the common good, lies the promise of all the years to come.

## THE AMERICAN ARMY UNIVERSITY AT SHRIVENHAM, ENGLAND

CAPTAIN WILLIAM P. BUTTLER  
STUDENT IN THE JOURNALISM SECTION

AND

CULLEN B. GOSNELL  
PROFESSOR OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

**T**AKE sixteen parts G.I.'s eager for education: add one part college professors; combine with Army methods and supplies, professors' improvisations, and American ingenuity; stir well, and pour into the rolling Berkshire hills—and you've got the Shrivenham American University, or simply "SAU" in England. It was a school unique in history, where the soldier was the only student, and his education was brought, literally, to his door.

Shrivenham American University opened for business with little fanfare on August 1 with an avowed purpose of bringing short educational courses on a college level to the men who were occupying Europe and awaiting redeployment home. It was America's answer to the old question, "How may the men better themselves and refresh what has slipped from their memories as they await their chances for reentering civilian life?"

Officers and men began college subjects ranging from aerodynamics to counterpoint, editorial administration to logic, and vector analysis to dance bands. Entering students were amazed when they were told that there were 260 different courses offered—in almost any subject that could be found in any American university at home.

But what really "floored" the students was the discovery that their teachers were to be real professors from American colleges—there were other instructors and assistants who were officers and men in the ETO and were requisitioned for the SAU. But they, too, were teachers or experts in their subjects in civilian life. Of the total of 231 instructors who offered courses on August 1, 133 were professors "imported" from the United States.

The student body was composed primarily of enlisted men, who numbered 3,339, with 1,104 of that number being privates and



privates first class. But there were 294 male officers, ranging from the 13 warrant officers to the 4 lieutenant colonels.

And the 20 nurses and 8 WACS present gave the school a slight coeducational slant. Officers and men rubbed elbows freely in classrooms and at athletics, and debated issues with their professors in a lively democratic manner. No rank consciousness was shown; it was simply an educational institution where each man was on his own.

A local detail of German prisoners of war did the menial labors of KP, scrubbing floors and the keeping up of the grounds. A cadre of officers and men ran the establishment like any other Army post, and thus, the students were left with much unaccustomed time for study and an educational inspection of the rich lore and tradition which surrounded the University.

The idea for an institution such as SAU goes back to the last war, when 14 French and 5 British schools were made available to a limited number of members of the AEF in Europe. The plan had several shortcomings. Chief among them was the shortage of facilities for the large number of men desiring schooling. Another fault was that no students could use the facilities at the French universities unless they had a good command of the language. And finally, in some cases, the standards of these institutions were not up to those set by American colleges.

When the present program was planned, these errors were carefully recalled, and officials were determined that this new venture into the educational field should not also fall by the wayside. The answer, after months of planning and doing what normally would have required years, was SAU.

Plans were begun early, during the summer and fall of 1944. American units were racing across France, and optimism ran high that the war would be over shortly. The War Department's information and education branch was not so sure, but began its postwar planning for the soldiers, anyway. A staff in Paris began an extensive survey by questioning G.I.'s from every branch of the Army in the ETO, and sounding them out on their preferences for courses if such were made available. The Belgian "Bulge" put an end to those plans and the idea was temporarily shelved.

With April, 1945, and the Rhine-crossing safely behind the

Yanks, the ideas were brought out and aired. The Paris branch of the I & E staff began to function again. At that time, the school's commandant, Brigadier General C. M. Thiele, formerly Theatre Anti-Aircraft Officer, was assigned to the post and told to select his staff.

Simultaneously, a half-dozen of America's leading educators were called to Washington. Dr. Kenneth E. Olson, who headed the School of Journalism at SAU, as he does at Northwestern University in the United States, was one of those pioneers.

Others who were among those early planners were: Elmer T. Peterson, Assistant Director of SAU's Academic Division, and at home, Dean of the College of Education of the University of Iowa; Julian T. Boatman, Head of the Agricultural Section, and in the States, Chief of the Subject Matter Division of the Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture; Robert F. Edgar, Head of SAU's Engineering Department, and Head of the Division of Mechanics at the University of Pittsburgh; Burnet C. Tuthill, Leader of the Fine Arts Section, and Director of the Memphis School of Music in the United States; Harry M. Gehman, Head of the Mathematics Branch at SAU, and at home Head of the Mathematics Department of the University of Buffalo; James R. Hawkinson, Chief of SAU's Commerce Section, and one of America's leading authorities on marketing.

These men and their associates were the guiding geniuses who began the monumental task of selecting and arranging for the faculty which the G.I.'s found a cause for amazement. They made long-distance phone calls to leading educators from Maine to California, each man checking for his own field. They promptly got into the Washington spirit and dubbed their office the BUC—"Bureau of Utter Confusion."

"There were three important 'musts' for every man chosen to teach at SAU," said Dr. Olson, who is himself a World War I veteran. "First of all, we wanted big names; leaders in their fields. But the second point was that they must be teachers, not theorists alone. We knew it would take more than mere theory to get men fresh from combat, and long removed from books, back into the study habit. So good classroom teachers were imperative."

"Perhaps the biggest point in the selection of the faculty was the last—that each member must have his heart in his job."

In addition to these measures, no professor was chosen who was under 42, for the psychological reason that such men were liable to be unconsciously censored by the combat soldiers for not being in service themselves. Another psychological move was the insertion of many outstanding professors with previous military experience, as they would be better able to understand, sympathize with, and advise men who intended to return to civilian life as these same instructors had.

With arrangements completed to this stage, Dr. Olson was flown to Paris to confer with the Army staff there. Findings of both groups were mutually agreeable.

General Thiele and his staff made an inspection trip to the future location of SAU in May, and they, as well as faculty members and students, are still wondering how the Army managed to find this site for the school that literally has "everything."

A visit to the location reveals there a rambling collection of neat brick buildings, bearing such names as Watson West and Borgard, not unlike an American campus at home. The effect is heightened by the neat lawns, trim paths and many athletic facilities.

This post, formerly Shrivenham Barracks, was built by the British Government in 1937 for use as an officers' training school, and has served since that date in various capacities for the British and American armies. Students were housed in comfortable brick barracks; their classrooms were, too, for the most part. High-ranking officers and instructors lived in neat small brick cottages off the campus, all a part of this original post. The entire area was until recently the estate of the Viscount of Barrington Hall.

Hurrying to and from their classes in these buildings or lounging on the lawns were the students, and like any such students in the States, they might be discussing the Mendelian theory, football, Chaucer or the dance next Friday night.

But here the illusion ends, for these students wore uniforms of the United States Army. They had the insignia of almost every unit and organization which helped in some way to rid

the Continent of Naziism. Their decorations included everything up to and including the Distinguished Service Cross and Flying Cross. There were over 300 men during the first term who wore the Purple Heart for wounds received in action.

The student body was made up of men from every state in the Union, plus the District of Columbia, Alaska, Puerto Rico and eight foreign countries. Their branches of service ranged from the Infantry, whose 21% led all other branches with 761 members, to the two men from the Military Intelligence.

Instead of the student stores found on American campuses at home, SAU had its Post Exchange and Red Cross Club. In the latter students of all ranks and their professors gathered to discuss the latest news, class topics—or any other subject that was common to college students and their faculty.

The professors wore the officers' green uniform, and this fact led to much pleasure for G.I.'s and consternation for stern Army officers. Needless to say, the professors did not have too good a military bearing, even though many of them were veterans of World War I.

The only brass worn by the civilian faculty members was on the buttons, and the ornamental "U.S." worn on the lapels. They had a simulated rank of company field grade officers, but made it plain to their soldier students that there was no rank as far as they were concerned. Regardless of degrees and doctorates, all civilian instructors were called "Mister," while the military instructors were called by their ranks. Their left shoulder sported the red, white and blue patches bearing the words "U.S. Army University Faculty."

Students and faculty alike made much of the rich historical lore that surrounded the campus and Shrivenham. Within two hours by bicycle these men could visit such points as Wayland Smithy, a Neolithic burial mound of 2000 B.C., White Horse Hill ruins probably dating to 71 A.D.; Ashbury where the first Sunday School classes in the world were started; Tom Brown's schoolhouse; the Blowing Stone, by which, according to legend, King Alfred called his followers from distances as great as five miles; and Alfred's Castle, an ancient Celtic fortification.

Students and faculty members of the English Department revelled in the Shakespearean lore in Stratford on Avon, within a

two-hour bus ride. And it was only an hour's trip to Oxford University. However, one astute history expert listed in "Who's Who" had made it his off-duty hobby to collect the odd names of British pubs, and at present he boasts a selection of 200. Among his gems are "The Fleece," "Cat's Alley," "Fighting Cocks Inn," and "The Leather Bottle."

Classes at SAU were conducted on the same plan as in any large American university. Courses were cut to two months' duration, but because of the intensified instruction and the quality of the work, leaders in the university were confident that American colleges would accept the results as worthy of credits. Because of the shortened term and the added burden on the men, a maximum of three subjects was allowed, plus the required three hours a week of physical training.

Procurement of supplies for a university was a problem even in the States. But Coast-Artillery Colonel Donald E. MacDonald, who was assigned as supply officer, found that SAU had its own particular brand of headaches. The University was not on any table of organization, and the supply staff had to wangle necessities from all arms of the service. Securing such items as live female models for the art course, sheet music for the musicians, furniture for all classrooms and offices and live earthworms and frogs for the sciences—through Army supply channels—proved too much. So reciprocal aid from the British War Office, through reverse lend lease eased the problem.

The Colonel became so accustomed to strange requests that he stated, "I have seen everything. I would not be at all surprised if some professor asked to have 150 years of tradition installed in his classroom. We'd probably be able to do it, too."

In the meantime officers were scouting through disbanding U. S. air depots and hospitals for some equipment. And London bookstores were scoured for texts that were urgently needed because the supplies ordered in the States were tardy in arriving.

Despite the fact that the Army sponsored this school, there was no coddling. Men were given standard tests, and returned to their units if they showed that they were not willing to take advantage of their studies. But each man was given every opportunity to seek advice, special tutoring and help from the professors who gave freely of their open time to the students.



Educational leaders of many European countries inspected SAU, and all were incredulous in what they found. SAU became a model for service schools for our own nation and those of other countries. The feelings of distinguished visitors were well expressed by a British Army School Commandant, Colonel G. S. Tillingham, who was quoted in the school's paper as saying during his August visit, "It's amazing, by Jove, that the British must come to the Americans in England to learn how to set up a school."

Selection of American soldiers to attend SAU was left up to parent units, and an example of the demand for such institutions as this school in England was the fact that an Infantry Division in Germany, numbering about 15,000 men, was given a quota of only 24. Shortly after SAU opened, another G.I. college opened at Biarritz, France. Plans for SAU and BAU were all the work of the combined staffs which went out in their pioneer work in Washington and Paris. The Mediterranean theatre was also represented with a college on the same lines, in Florence, Italy.

Educators at SAU noted with surprise that the students of their college, while members of the most mechanized army in history, were turning from the exact sciences to social studies. Opening day records showed a total enrolment of 826 in the fine arts and only 384 in engineering. And while the biology, chemistry and physics courses recorded a total of 623 students, history, economics, political science and sociology showed a total of 1,140. Other interesting figures were the 763 men enrolled in agricultural courses, 2,645 in commerce, and 359 in journalism.

Despite its nomadic nature, because it is built up of short term personnel from all ETO units, and the men must be returned to their organizations if the latter were ready for redeployment before the two-month courses were completed, SAU built up a real school spirit.

One professor in the music department wrote an Alma Mater which would do credit to an American university at home. An art instructor designed a coat-of-arms, bearing the motto, "Victoria per Scientiam" (Victory through Knowledge). The school boasted athletic teams known as the "schoolboys"; the drama and speech departments presented plays and radio programs; and the journalism section put out the *Shrivenham Post*, an excellent newspaper.



One département head said, "The men are going to their studies in an amazing manner. It is a stimulating thing for the professors, for here they find no typical 'Joe Collegians.' These men are serious; they know what they want; and they are studying in a phenomenal way." He expected these men and their fellows in other areas to inject a new stimulus into American educational systems when they get home again.

But to the students, veterans of one of the bloodiest wars in history, this attention to duty and concentration on their studies was their way of saying "Thanks" to a grateful nation which showed its appreciation for a job well done.

## BETTER TEACHER PREPARATION

KARL W. BIGELOW

PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION, TEACHERS COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY  
(FORMERLY DIRECTOR, COMMISSION ON TEACHER EDUCATION,  
AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION)

AS MOST of you are aware the Commission on Teacher Education was set up by the American Council on Education in 1938 and continued in existence for nearly seven years. Representatives of the Association of American Colleges were consulted when the creation of the Commission was being considered; indeed your organization gave a formal pledge of encouragement and support at that time. Later President Harry M. Gage, chairman of your own commission on teacher education, became a member of the Council's commission. As such he ably represented the point of view of the colleges of liberal arts. It seems highly appropriate that you should today be receiving a report regarding the work of the Commission.

The Commission worked fundamentally through association with cooperating units in the field. Its nationwide study included fifty such units, half colleges and universities, half public school systems. Among the former were some half dozen arts colleges. At least sixty-five more such institutions were involved in the Commission's statewide studies, carried on in ten different states.

The aim of the Commission throughout its period of field activity was to assist local units in striving to bring about improvements at any or all points relating to teacher education. To that end the Commission provided a variety of services: consultants were sent on call; conferences and workshops were arranged; a collaboration center in child growth and development was established; and the exchange of information was facilitated in various ways.

Now during the past year or two the Commission has been publishing a series of reports based on its experiences in the field and setting forth its thinking and that of its staff members growing out of those experiences. In *Teachers for Our Times* the Commission stated its own basic point of view. *The College and*

NOTE: Address delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Association of American Colleges, Cleveland, Ohio, January 10, 1946.

*Teacher Education*, by Armstrong, Hollis and Davis, was based on the work of cooperating colleges and universities. Both of these books were calculated to be of value to college administrators and faculties; with both you have now had time enough to become familiar. You have had less time, however, to become acquainted with the two most recent Commission reports, each of which should also prove of interest to you. *State Programs for the Improvement of Teacher Education*, by Prall, is based on the statewide programs to which I referred a moment ago, programs in which many colleges took part. *Toward Improving Ph.D. Programs*, by Hollis, relates to a problem in which your association has long been interested—the preparation of college teachers.<sup>1</sup>

Now in press is the Commission's own concluding statement, a volume to be entitled *The Improvement of Teacher Education*. The second chapter of this book will be devoted to teacher preparation, the aspect of teacher education in which you may be presumed to be mainly interested. It has seemed to me, consequently, that I could not do better in reporting to you this afternoon than to quote the summary passage from that chapter. In this way I can give you, in advance of the book's publication, an exact knowledge of what the Commission has to say and recommend.

But before I proceed to read the passage in question, I should like to ask you to watch for certain things that characterize it. Please note, for example, the emphasis on ways and means of promoting faculty unity and faculty group action. Observe, too, how all aspects of a college program for prospective teachers are considered, how the interplay and overlap of these customarily distinguished elements are stressed, how integration of the entire program and its organization into relatively large blocks of time are urged, and to what a considerable degree recommendations have relevance to the cases of all students—not merely to those preparing to teach. You are pretty certain, I think, to be struck by the absence of any effort to define an ideal program in full detail: this characteristic reflects the Commission's recognition of institutional differences and its belief that improvement can

<sup>1</sup> All of the books mentioned are published by the American Council on Education, 744 Jackson Place, Washington 6, D. C.

best be achieved when each institution moves ahead in response to its own developing purposes and insights.

Let me now give you the Commission's chief conclusions respecting the preparation of teachers. They are as follows:

1. The improvement of teacher preparation depends immediately on the capacity, understanding and cooperativeness of those charged with its conduct at particular colleges and universities. Every effort, then, should be made to strengthen faculties, extend participation in the realistic study of the job jointly to be done, encourage coordination of effort and support the continuous evaluation of programs as well as experimental efforts to better them. This implies the employment of democratic procedures calculated to facilitate the steady in-service growth of the teachers of teachers.

2. Whatever increases a faculty's sense of shared responsibility for teacher preparation and its stock of common understanding of factors to be considered is likely to increase the unity of an institution or program and lead to added effectiveness. In the cooperative study the development of personnel programs in which many instructors learned how to counsel students respecting personal, academic and vocational problems—all three—helped in this connection. So did firsthand study of the schools and teachers in service and their actual problems—study participated in by both subject-matter professors and educationists. Joint study of the communities served was also helpful.

3. The use of consultants—including college and university experts, state department officials, school administrators and experienced teachers—proved helpful, as did visits to schools and to other colleges where outstanding practices might be observed. Also of definite value were participation in working conferences, workshops and statewide cooperative studies.

4. The most effective way of making steady improvements was that which combined continuous attention to fundamental institutional purposes and policies with the use of concentrated spearhead attacks at a succession of particular points. The latter were especially fruitful when they had broad implications and when these were carefully developed.

5. The most effective and justifiable recruiting and selective processes are those that consider a variety of factors together,

that concern themselves with the guidance of the student as well as with the welfare of children and of society, that enable the individual to share in the responsibilities of decision, and that provide for periodical reconsideration of the wisdom of previous decisions. Prospective teachers should be superior specimens of the culture, but it ought to be recognized that good teachers may represent various combinations of talent, background and interest.

6. Teachers adequate for our times cannot be prepared in less than four collegiate years. The trend towards five-year programs for both secondary and elementary school teachers deserves encouragement where practical considerations permit it to operate, and this without distinction as to whether these persons are to teach in urban or rural communities.

7. So far as possible all educational experiences provided as elements in a program of teacher preparation should be planned with reference to each other so that they may combine to meet effectively the personal, social and vocational needs of students. Unity and continuity of programs should be striven for.

8. The primary objectives of at least three eighths of the undergraduate work of prospective teachers should be those properly ascribable to general education. It is undesirable that this part of a student's work should be concentrated in the freshman and sophomore years with an implication that general education may be "completed" during this period, or with the consequence that attention to professional concerns must be postponed until a later time. Instruction primarily designed for general education should give attention to any implications of its subject matter for professional development. The reverse holds equally true.

9. Advanced subject-matter instruction for teachers should exhibit the highest standards of scholarship. Offerings in a particular field should, however, be planned and conducted with informed reference to the tasks that prospective teachers will eventually be called upon to perform. This should result in more attention to the interrelations of departmentalized subjects and to practical implications for personal and social well-being.

10. The study of human growth and development, particularly during childhood and adolescence, should constitute one of the basic elements in the professional preparation of teachers. This

implies attention both to a synthesis of materials drawn from various biological, psychological and social sciences and also to the cases of particular individuals.

11. Of comparable importance in teacher education is the study of the nature and problems of community and broader social existence. Such study should aim not only at comprehension but also at development of the impulse to share in social action and of skill in so doing. Informed social purpose and intelligent social participation are particularly desirable in teachers. Acquaintance with rural communities and their problems is especially indicated when teachers are likely to begin their professional work in such communities.

12. Understanding of the arts, and facility in non-verbal expression, should also receive greater emphasis in teacher preparatory programs.

13. The organization of general education and of the professional part of the preparatory program into relatively large blocks of time, with a conscious effort to increase integration, continuity and flexibility, is more likely to prove effective than the use of a larger number of separately specialized short courses.

14. With the lengthening of the customary period of teacher preparation the importance of providing students with direct experiences in relation to classroom study has increased. Special attention should be given to enabling prospective teachers to study children, schools and communities at first hand—not merely to observe them but to work with them with some appropriate degree of responsibility. Such opportunity should begin fairly early in the preparatory program and be continued in complementary relation to a variety of classroom experiences. Campus school facilities and those that may be provided through suitable arrangements with nearby public schools should be fully capitalized in this connection. Available opportunities for prospective teachers to work with children in non-school situations should be employed.

15. It is particularly important that programs of teacher preparation should throughout contribute to the development and strengthening of democratic powers. These notably include the ability to think, feel and act for oneself and also capacity to work effectively as one of a group. Consequently teacher



preparation should consistently enable prospective teachers to share responsibly in planning and carrying out their own educational programs and provide them with regular experience in cooperative endeavor.

16. Student teaching is a most important part of the preparation of teachers. It should come near the close of the college or university course, and should be carefully prepared for by faculty members acquainted with prospective student teaching situations. Such preparation will be facilitated when a campus school is available or, alternatively, a neighboring public school over which the institution shares control whereby proper supervision and direction can be guaranteed. However, it is most desirable for prospective teachers to be provided with a culminating experience of full-time work in representative off-campus schools, especially in rural schools if that is where first regular teaching experience is likely to be. Up to eight or nine weeks may profitably be so employed.

17. Student teaching experience should provide opportunities not merely to carry on instruction but also to become acquainted with the children, the staff, the life and the problems of the whole school in which the experience is had. Students should live in the community if possible and have time to study it and participate in its activities. The college should provide students with guidance during their time in the field, and on their return they should be enabled to compare their experience and to discuss the implications thereof with various staff members.

18. The entire program of teacher preparation—including extra-curricular experiences—should be designed to facilitate the balanced growth of the prospective teacher as a whole person. Fundamental concern with assuring his professional effectiveness is far from justifying neglect of other aspects of his total development. The effective teacher is an effective citizen.

19. Strictly professional elements should be allocated from one eighth to one sixth of the time available in a four- or five-year program of teacher preparation. It is to be recognized that there will be doubt as to whether some important elements should be classified as general or as professional education, and that acceptable integrations may be worked out that cause the professional block to *appear* to exceed or to fall short of this proportion.

20. Evaluation should play an important role in teacher preparation. Prospective teachers should learn to evaluate their own strengths and weaknesses and to help children and young people to do the same. They should learn to evaluate the effectiveness of teaching procedures as a means to the continuous improvement of their own work. And college staffs should be constantly employing evaluative techniques for the same reason.

21. The placement of graduates is a responsibility that should be jointly shared in by the colleges and universities, the students themselves and the school systems. The same is true of the planning of follow-up arrangements. Both, therefore, call for the cultivation of cordial cooperative relationships between schools and colleges as well as full respect for the individuals involved.

22. The importance of continuous give and take between college faculties and the staffs of representative schools is so great as to deserve special emphasis. In this way the college program can be checked at every point as to its effectiveness for teacher preparation. In this way, also, the schools can be kept in constant touch with valuable resources for the study improvement of their own programs and the systematic facilitation of professional growth on the part of their personnel.

I have now discharged my main function at this meeting as I have conceived it: I have provided you with a preview of what the Commission on Teacher Education will have to say in its forthcoming final report. But perhaps I may be permitted, in conclusion, to offer a few personal comments on the role of colleges of liberal arts in teacher education. Historically that role has been a very important one, as you are all aware. It still is. Yet there are evidences of change in the situation that ought not to be overlooked.

I have been struck, for example, by the volume of complaint that I have heard from superintendents of schools and other employing officers respecting the job of teacher preparation being done by such institutions as you represent. What I have heard from them sounds not unlike what I have heard from you as regards the job being done for you by the university graduate schools. It is charged that the colleges of liberal arts are not really deeply interested in teacher education, that faculty members are chiefly concerned with their own subjects and resentful

of demands that they take the vocational needs of prospective teachers into account. It is even charged that many professors look down upon school teaching and discourage their ablest students from considering such work.

Many schoolmen, moreover, feel that the colleges of liberal arts are unacquainted and unsympathetic with the problems of contemporary public schools. They themselves are struggling to create the best possible high schools for all the children of all the people, it being more and more the fact that all these children are actually continuing in school through the twelfth grade. Thus they feel the need of teachers quite different in many ways from those who might be satisfactory for institutions specializing in college preparation. These schoolmen fear that many colleges are not interested in producing such teachers. They are sure that most college programs of teacher preparation are not now functionally adequate for such a purpose.

I cannot tell you just how widespread or deep-seated the feelings I have been reporting to you are. But I am sure they add up to enough to call for serious consideration. I should hate to see the colleges of liberal arts lose or abandon their share in the great work of teacher education. I hope that all of you agree.

What might be done to counteract existing threats? I can think of a number of things that are worth enumeration. It would be very helpful if there could be a new facing up by college leaders to the social importance of public education and to the colleges' responsibility for producing superior teachers for the schools. In recent years President Conant of Harvard has frequently struck such notes; it would be a fine thing if many other presidential voices could be added to his.

Promotion of closer acquaintance between faculty members and leaders in the public schools is also desirable. Such acquaintance, I hasten to add, should not be limited to members of departments of education; indeed it is particularly important that leading representatives of the various subject matters should have more contact with the situations in which their students may later serve as teachers. From such contact should spring a recognition of the inadequacy of existing programs of teacher preparation and a readiness to share in bringing about their improvement.

It must be recognized, of course, that in a college of liberal arts improvement in teacher education has to be brought about in integral relation to the total program of undergraduate work. This indicates the desirability of tying the more special efforts in with broad approaches to general curricular reform, and of the consequent participation of many faculty members. It is wholly unsound to think of teacher education as embracing only what is done by the department of education and hence as no affair of the members of other departments.

This leads me to refer to the demonstrated values of institutional participation in cooperative studies designed to promote educational improvements, especially with reference to teacher education. The Commission's statewide studies commanded the interest of many colleges of liberal arts and stimulated desirable action on many campuses. This is made abundantly clear in the report by Prall to which I made earlier reference. Similarly significant has been the cooperative study that has been going forward for the last several years under the sponsorship of the North Central Association and the immediate leadership of Russell M. Cooper. That study, focused on the preparation of secondary school teachers, now includes over seventy institutions, the vast majority colleges of liberal arts. Its notable growth, and the fact that each participant contributes to the cost of the common endeavor, indicate the value of membership as felt by those most intimately involved. I know that many present in this audience could testify to that value from their own experience.

It has been a privilege to appear before you this afternoon and to report to you for the Commission on Teacher Education. I hope you share my conviction as to the importance of my theme.

We live in a time that challenges democratic education as never before. The adequate preparation of young citizens to share in meeting the emergent problems of American life requires teachers of the highest order. Approximately a million such teachers are needed to serve some thirty million children. Before the war it was estimated that at any given time there were more than a quarter of a million teachers in attendance at our colleges and universities—nearly one fifth of the total body of undergraduates.

Both qualitatively and quantitatively, then, the task of teacher education is seen to be a great one. It needs today to be done better than ever before. The colleges of liberal arts have special resources for helping with this task. Theirs is a great opportunity, through effort continued and renewed, to make a great contribution in a great national cause.

## PHARMACY EDUCATION

KELCY KERN

**T**HE needs of wartime proved the vital importance of many professions which have been largely taken for granted in the past, and among these is pharmacy.

The shortage of pharmacists as a result of wartime demands and conditions caused by wartime dislocations in the field of pharmacy education, has brought this matter to the fore in educational, surgical, medical, sanitary and allied fields of interest. Some facts and figures from a recent survey of this situation are not only of direct interest to educators, but likewise to all those health-protection professions and industries which depend upon the services of the registered pharmacist.

Quoting Dr. E. L. Newcomb, Secretary, American Foundation for Pharmaceutical Education: "Recent surveys show that some 8,500 young men—and women—with bachelor of science degrees are needed to operate retail drugstores, and that another 1,000 with doctor's or master's degrees in pharmaceutical subjects are needed as drug industry research workers and as teachers.

"As we look into the future, the problem is still further complicated by the fact that the mortality rate among pharmacists (approximately 2,200 a year) exceeds the average number of pharmacists (1,800) that our colleges graduated annually before the war reduced enrolments.

"Thus, it seems evident that, five years from now, there will be added to the present shortage of pharmacists another 10,000 resulting from mortality in this profession. This will bring the total number of openings in the field to nearly 20,000—or more than twice the number of graduates our colleges of pharmacy normally would produce during that period."

It will thus be seen that pharmacy education upon which so many health activities depend becomes of great importance, and the need for guiding more qualified young people into it apparent.

In 1940, there were 82,000 registered pharmacists in this country:

72,000 in retail pharmacies

5,000 in drug and pharmaceutical manufacture



3,000 in hospital pharmacies  
1,000 in teaching, journalism and research work  
1,000 in state and federal health services

The Armed Services took over 10,000 registered pharmacists of which not more than 7,000 can be expected to return to pharmacy now that the war is over. However, the decline in the number of graduates at our colleges of pharmacy in the past few years is a vital aspect of the situation. From a total of about 1,600 graduates a year in 1941, the number graduating in 1945 was a mere handful. The result is that many pharmacies, each a local health center, closed. Also, manufacturers of pharmaceuticals, hospitals and laboratories have felt the pinch.

What does pharmacy offer as a profession?

Earnings easily compare with those in any other similar profession calling for an equal amount of preparation and giving a comparable service. Earnings, of course, vary with locality and the job, as well as the ability of the individual. As a pharmacy owner, income may range from \$2000 or \$3000 a year and up to many times that. Pharmaceutical laboratories and hospitals often pay as much as \$35 per week and up to perhaps twice that. All salaries increase with the experience of the individual. And 90 per cent of all pharmacists own their own stores.

Constantly more women are entering pharmacy.

For instance, before World War II only 11 per cent of all pharmacy graduates were women. Today the percentage is nearer 40. This increase in the war years was partly due to the drafting of men students. In one state alone, 19 out of 23 graduates are women.

In most states, the practicing pharmacist must hold a bachelor of science degree from an accredited college of pharmacy, then serve at least one year for practical experience in a retail pharmacy before taking state examinations leading to a license to practice. Though the figure varies, the cost of a course in pharmacy is \$750 annually, including room and meals (non-resident). In some cases, it has been found possible for the student to work his or her way through, and there are numerous scholarships in this field of education.

Many veterans, both men and women, are going into pharmacy, some of them having had advance training in the Army, Navy

or Coast Guard. In any case, the veteran first checks with the nearest college of pharmacy to determine qualifications. Then, from the regional office of the Veterans Administration a certificate of eligibility is secured, and application is then made by the college for tuition and allowances under the GI Bill of Rights. The American Foundation for Pharmaceutical Education, 330 West 42nd Street, New York City, is sending free, upon request, copies of two booklets, *Your Future In Pharmacy*, and *Pharmacy As A Career For Veterans*.

Pharmacy appeals to many young people, first, because it offers a chance to serve in a field of activity vital to the Nation—health protection—second, because the modern pharmacist almost always becomes a merchant. And it is clearly indicated that this will not be a “crowded” profession for some time to come.

## HIGHER TECHNOLOGICAL EDUCATION IN ENGLAND

H. LOWERY

PRINCIPAL, SOUTH-WEST ESSEX TECHNICAL COLLEGE,  
WALTHAMSTOW, ESSEX, ENGLAND

**R**ECENTLY an American army officer with whom I was discussing various aspects of social life in England and America, suddenly said to me, "You know, I can make neither head nor tail of your English system of education: it seems to be just one huge bundle of anomalies. You appear to have some forty different kinds of schools, all totally unrelated; your universities are a strange mixture of residential and non-residential with a glaring anomaly in the case of London with its external degrees, and as for your technical colleges, well, I utterly fail to see how they fit into the scheme as no two are alike. Yet, I must hand it to you, your system, or want of system, does achieve results."

I think our friend's judgment is shrewder than he knew, for the English educational system is like Topsy, it "just grewed." Additions and subtractions have been made according to the requirements of the moment, and have produced a flexible medium to meet any demands that may be made on it; the least we can say is that it has achieved *ad hoc* results, while at its best, through its freedom from overplanning, it has produced great men in every walk of life. The standard of our English scholarship is, I submit, second to none.

But if we do not conform to a blueprint, that is not to say that we do not now and again take stock of our educational system and exclaim "Whither?" As a matter of fact, during the past hundred years we have held numerous Royal Commissions on education whose brief has been to determine the most advanced thought on the various branches of educational practice, both at home and abroad, and to make suggestions as to what adaptations in the existing system might be made in order to bring it up-to-date. The outsider is often surprised to find that only rarely are the suggestions adopted in their original form, though perhaps after a time lag of a quarter of a century most of the suggestions will be found to have been sifted and absorbed into the system, in conformity with the existing system itself and not, be it noted,

as a superadded element. The English are indeed a cautious people, but this caution in educational affairs is responsible for the high standard of scholarship, craftsmanship, reliability and integrity of character, for which the English are noted.

In April 1944, the British Government, with a new Education Act on its hands, based on the admirable policy of "opportunity according to age, aptitude and ability," decided that once again the field of technical education should be reviewed so that any fresh trends or industrial needs might be incorporated in the new educational developments. Accordingly, a Departmental Committee of Britain's Ministry of Education was set up with the following terms of reference: "Having regard to the requirements of industry, to consider the needs of higher technological education in England and Wales and the respective contributions to be made thereto by Universities and Technical Colleges; and to make recommendations, among other things, as to the means for maintaining appropriate collaboration between Universities and Technical Colleges in this field." The Chairman of the Committee was the Right Honorable Lord Eustace Percy, Rector of the Newcastle Division of the University of Durham, hence the Report, now published, is referred to as the "Percy Report." The constitution of the Committee was as follows: two University Vice-Chancellors (in addition to the Chairman), four Technical College Principals, one Chairman of a Local Education Authority, one Director of Education, one University Professor, the Director of the National Physical Laboratory, and three Industrial Directors, together with several officers of the Ministry of Education.

The Committee has made an admirable survey of its subject, obviously inspired by the important principle that training and education must not be divorced. Technologists at the highest stages must be men (and women) of that wide culture which can only be secured by a liberal education. Indeed, throughout the Report it is quite clear that the Committee was in no two minds as to the need to preserve our high university standards in the face of any insistent demands for the production of specialist technicians. Many suggestions for alterations in established educational procedure are contained in the Report, and though the writer considers that in the main these are not likely to be carried

out in the form presented, there can be no possible doubt that the Report is going to have a profound influence on high technological work in England for years to come, because of its enlightened approach to problems that have only too often in the past been seen myopically. It is proposed, therefore, to consider below some of the findings and recommendations of the Committee.

Let it be said right away that the Percy Committee was not appointed to prepare a plan for reconstructing a deficient technical educational system; the wonderful successes of the English technical colleges and universities in producing trained technical personnel for industry and His Majesty's Forces during World War II give the lie to that. Instead, the Committee had to survey the possible new demands that would be made on the training institutions in connection with the determined efforts that the Government has in mind for the development of our postwar trade, both at home and abroad, and how best such demands might be met. As to the former, fortunately, the wartime Central Technical Register of Britain's Ministry of Labor was able to give something approaching to a firm estimate of the numbers of technologists required, for the Ministry had itself, very wisely, during World War II, stimulated substantially the output of technologists, and in particular that of engineers with which the "Percy Report" deals almost exclusively.

Here, it must be explained that the English technical colleges, during the past 24 years have developed technical courses leading, after five years of part-time study, to Higher National Certificates in some branch of technology, awarded jointly by the training institution, the professional institution concerned and Britain's Ministry of Education.

These certificates are approximately of the standard of a "pass" degree at the universities. The Ministry of Labor during World War II gave recognition to these certificates by allowing students deferment from military service in order to complete their courses and then placing them in research or other technical posts for which their qualifications were suitable. The Ministry also encouraged with marked success the formation of short intensive courses of six months' duration to increase the output of Higher National men.

By stimulating the output of engineering degree men from the

universities in a similar way the Ministry in 1943 reached an annual supply of 3,000 degree and certificate men in engineering. According to the Report, "Our problem is to maintain this war output for at least the next ten years." Added to this, it must be remembered that our universities have also to meet the demand for training overseas students (not included above) and the training of technical teachers. "What the situation requires, therefore, is an energetic program of expansion, both in accommodation and staff, which will tax to the full the resources of Universities and Technical Colleges, coupled with arrangements for keeping a close watch upon the demand which this program is intended to meet." Moreover, the demand must be met "in terms of quality"—"men fitted for executive responsibility; men capable not only of research, but of applying the results of research to development"; "a demand for special qualities and for a high grade both of ability and character."

It is thus seen that the Report strikes a noble chord, and at once sets an ideal well calculated to produce an industrial atmosphere worthy of a great democracy, the individual personnel being no mere cogs in an inhuman industrial machine. The remainder of the Report deals with some detailed suggestions as to how increased numbers of technologists of the above calibre may be produced.

Thus, a small number of technical colleges (to be called "Colleges of Technology") should be raised to a status comparable with that of universities, and be free, like universities, to adapt their examinations to their teaching and to award their own qualification, for example, a degree or diploma in technology. Such colleges would shed all elementary work and concentrate on higher studies and research. Their administration would conform to that of the universities and their staffs would be interchangeable with those of the latter.

In the writer's opinion, the most vital recommendation of the Report is "that Regional Advisory Councils should be established throughout England and Wales" for the purpose of coordination of technological studies in universities, colleges of technology and other technical colleges in the region. Moreover, the regional machinery should have its national counterpart in a central body—a National Council of Technology. Experience has shown that



the financing and development of policy in technical education is too big a matter to be handled with complete efficiency by local education authorities, but the above suggestion would combine the advantages of local interest with a broad national policy, and canalize Government financial help where necessary. Hence its great significance.

The Report deals at some length with the need to ease the burden of the part-time technical student, for example, by urging firms to cooperate with the educational institutions in developing part-time day release courses so that students may receive some of their instruction in the day-time instead of entirely by means of evening classes. Very promising students should be given facilities (traveling and residential) to enable them to attend full-time courses in the universities and colleges of technology.

The Report concludes with a reference to two other important matters, namely, "the need for training in industrial management and the need for special arrangements within industry to enable teachers of technology to keep their knowledge up-to-date." As to the former, some highly trained technicians are required with a sound knowledge of the principles of industrial organization and management, able to accept administrative responsibility; training for this should take place at both the undergraduate and postgraduate stages.

Several years before World War II, England had embarked on a great expansion of technical education through a building program costing 12 million pounds sterling (\$48,000,000). A number of new colleges thus came into existence embodying many original ideas on education for industry and commerce, and possessing facilities for the practice of the latest teaching methods. The war merely interrupted this scheme which will be resumed with increased vigor at an early date. The "Percy Report" will form a powerful directive to this and to other development schemes which are behind our country's determination to help win the peace.

## THE ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION IN A DEMOCRACY

MARTIN TEN HOOR

DEAN, COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA

### I

**E**VERY thoughtful believer in democracy is periodically confronted with a dilemma: he must choose between centralization and distribution of political authority, neither of which seems wholly desirable to him. Increase in centralization always seems to promise increase in efficiency, and this appeals to his sense of decency and order. Distribution, on the other hand, seems more truly democratic, and it is to democracy that he is, after all, committed. The dilemma was first faced by the founding fathers when they sought to apportion power between the federal government and the individual states. Since then, every citizen, from justice of the Supreme Court to humble voter, has sooner or later been compelled to choose one or the other.

It is not only in the realm of national and state politics that he has had to make this difficult choice. He has also had to face this issue in the narrower though hardly less important field of the administration of public education. Here the objective was the effective coordination of the numerous and varied tax-supported educational institutions; the obvious means, centralization of administrative authority; the difficulty, how to attain this objective by this means without an undemocratic and dangerous concentration of power.

In as much as the federal constitution originally assigned the responsibility for education to the several states, the solution of the dilemma was the business of the legislative assembly and, in the last analysis, of the citizens of each state. The history of legislative attempts to effect or improve the coordination of educational facilities by means of centralization of administrative authority extends from 1784, when the New York Assembly undertook to provide for centralized control of all its tax-supported schools and colleges, to May, 1945, when a bill directed to the same end was introduced in the Alabama legislature. With respect to scope and concreteness, provisions and proposals differ

radically. The legislators of the state of Wisconsin, in providing for the establishment of a state university in the constitution of 1848, contented themselves with the phrase, "and for connecting with same (i.e., the state university), from time to time, such colleges in different parts of the state as the interests of education may require." The radical proponents of centralization of educational administration in the Alabama legislature, however, startled the educators of the state by proposing "to combine in a single board the supervision and control of educational activities and functions in all public institutions and schools supported by tax monies." The Wisconsin provision, if it may be designated by so positive a term, was little more than a pious wish, and its effect was accordingly. The Alabama plan achieved the extreme in the prescription of centralization of authority within the limits of the state—but it was never reported out of committee.

Not all legislative attempts at solution were so weak or so ill-starred, however. In the course of the history of the movement to achieve coordination, a considerable number and variety of plans were adopted and are now actually in effect in various states of the Union. The lowest degree of centralization is represented by the type in which all the elementary and secondary schools are under the control of the state board of education, but in which each of the tax-supported universities, colleges, and teacher training schools is administered by its own independent board. The type in which all the institutions of higher education are likewise under the control of a single board represents the happy medium. The extreme in centralization is represented by the plan in which an overall governing board controls the entire tax-supported educational system, with responsibility for the direction of the education of its citizens and prospective citizens "from the cradle to the grave," as a not too friendly critic put it. Under this plan, the jurisdiction of the board embraces nursery schools, kindergartens, elementary and secondary schools, continuation schools, junior colleges, teacher training institutions, and all undergraduate and graduate schools, both those on and off the campus of the state university.

## II

Although the order of the above classification is logical rather

than chronological, it roughly represents the trend towards greater and greater centralization which history actually reveals. Neither the development nor the significance of this trend can be comprehended without a clear understanding of the conditions out of which it grew. Among these conditions, the most important is the remarkable multiplication of institutions of higher education. By 1941, this country had accumulated the astonishing total of 1,769, of which number 619 were tax-supported. This multiplication was in part due to natural causes, namely, growth in population and the faith in universal education which has been so characteristic of American democracy. It was in part the result of artificial stimulation; for a substantial number of these institutions owed their existence to local pride, to the "pork-barrel" philosophy of local politicians, or to the unwise generosity and limited vision of private philanthropists.

A secondary condition, which was a natural consequence of this prolific growth in numbers, was the great variation in the quality of educational service rendered by these institutions. Educational standards ranged from those which enjoyed national renown to those which were considered discreditable, even locally. Accrediting agencies and professional organizations, state, regional, and national in scope, exerted great pressure and brought about much improvement. However, this improvement often did not go beyond the acceptance of minimum standards, and these standards had themselves to some extent been adjusted to the realities of the situation, including the limited potentialities of the weaker institutions.

It was inevitable that once the boom period of institutional development had come to an end, there would come a time for taking stock. The conviction that this required expert analysis led to the development of the now familiar educational survey. A report of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, published in 1937, takes note of 585 surveys made during the period, 1903 to 1937. In its most highly developed form, the survey is a comprehensive analysis and constructive criticism of the organization, administration, cost and effectiveness of an educational unit or system of units, conducted by a commission, composed of laymen and educators, and directed by

professional experts usually called consultants. Surveys in the realm of public education range in scope from those concerned with a single institution to those which encompass the entire system of public education of a state. The first official statewide survey was that conducted by the Virginia Education Commission, the report of which was published in 1912. The latest to be reported is that of the Mississippi Commission, which was completed in the summer of 1945.

These surveys played an important role in the development of the trend towards centralization of administration, for they furnished its proponents with supporting facts and figures. The most serious malconditions in public education which these statewide surveys exposed were over-expansion, lack of standardization, and inefficient and wasteful administration, all of which were particularly prevalent in the realm of higher education. The unwise multiplication of institutions of higher learning was shown to have had many undesirable consequences and to have been the occasion, or the excuse, for some regrettable practices. There was unnecessary duplication of educational services and, in consequence, wasteful expenditure of public money. Sometimes requests for funds were based upon nothing more important than the desire "to keep up with the Joneses." Particularly in states which were unable or unwilling to be generous in appropriations for education, funds had to be spread so thin that undesirable accommodations had to be made in professional qualifications of personnel, quality of teaching and character of equipment.

Since there usually were not enough funds to go around, and sometimes not enough students, the natural rivalries of competing institutions were abnormally intensified. In a few cases investigators were inclined to feel that the state of mind of the alumni, and even of the presidents, of competing institutions approached the pathological. The members of the legislature, who controlled the purse-strings, invariably became involved in these rivalries. The pressure on them came from all sides: from local politicians who could not well be indifferent to the interests and wishes of their constituents; from the presidents of the institutions, ambitious for their institutions or for themselves; from the alumni, with their nostalgic memories and blind loyalties; from miscel-



laneous local boosters and public-spirited citizens; from the students and their equally partisan parents; and, finally, from the voters living within the sphere of influence of the institution, the overwhelming majority of whom are usually partisans, athletic and otherwise, of their "home" college or university. Confused and genuinely alarmed by the intensity and intransigence of rival advocates and unable to reconcile their claims, the governor and the more sensible of the members of the legislature in several cases initiated the survey and petitioned the experts for relief.

Not the least of the undesirable consequences of the multiplication of independent and uncoordinated institutions was the lack of standardization in administrative practices, in curricular organization, in admissions, in standards of student performance, and in requirements for degrees. Regrettable as the lack of uniformity in administrative organization and practice might be, the professional experts were much more concerned about the departures from sound educational standards. Once again it was the pressure of competition, in this case for students, that had caused most of the mischief. Most of the surveys revealed that the desire to attract students had induced institutions to expand offerings beyond capacity for acceptable performance, to offer courses which were currently popular but which were of only passing interest and importance or which were not of college grade, and, in some cases, to make admission, promotion and graduation easier of accomplishment than did some troublesome rival.

### III

Although the existence of these undesirable conditions had for a long time been recognized and deplored by educator and layman alike, the expert diagnosis in official surveys always came to local communities with something of a shock. Moreover, as surveys became more and more frequent and thorough, the accumulation of the evidence and the repetition of strictures and recommendations excited public as well as professional opinion. Reactions were in consequence often a bit extreme, and language was sometimes extravagant. Looking back on the haphazard growth of the system of higher education in his own state, a prominent Georgia educator remarked: "From 1785 to 1932, the



multiplication of the branches of the University continued so fast that it was not halted until there was fastened upon the state an educational monstrosity with twenty-six branches, bearing the misnomer, the University of Georgia." There was talk about "immeasurable waste" and "reckless extravagance." There were impracticable suggestions for elimination or consolidation, and romantic visions of efficiency and economy. Previous inattention and indifference were compensated for by enthusiasm and determination. The attitude of the public towards educational reform was in some cases affected by special conditions. Thus during the depression the plea for economy was particularly welcome. Students of the history of the survey movement have called attention to the fact that this movement developed unusual momentum during the lean 1930's. Its current popularity in the Deep South is no doubt partly due to the fact that educational leaders hope to find by means of the surveys some acceptable way of compensating for the small populations and low incomes of their states.

However, the early enthusiasm for centralization has been succeeded by a more sober and critical attitude. This attitude has been engendered by a suspicion that both expert opinion and public reaction are in danger of carrying us too far. There is a growing feeling that survey experts are developing a professional tendency, natural under the circumstances, to look upon centralization as an end in itself. It has been suggested that in their absorption with economy, efficiency and standardization, the professional consultants are showing a tendency to lose sight of the fact that these ends must after all be subordinated to the ultimate purposes of education, and more particularly, to those of education in a democracy. There is also the feeling that public reaction to the survey reports gives cause for concern. The public has indulged its well-known habit of magnifying reports of the shortcomings of public institutions and public officials, with the result that both revelations and recommendations are being considered in an overheated atmosphere. The situation has been further confused by the fact that some politicians, always on the lookout for live issues, have taken "strong positions" and are thus influencing their followers to take equally partisan attitudes. The present disposition of many educators is therefore to proceed with caution.

This caution has manifested itself first of all in a reexamination of the criteria which have been applied in the surveys. The questions that are being asked are these: Are duplication and overlapping and the extra expense which they involve wholly undesirable? Do not competition and rivalry have some effects which ought to be safeguarded? How far can we go with the centralization of educational administration without endangering values which are far more important than economy and efficiency? What will be the long-range effect on democratic ideals and institutions of this growing movement towards standardization?

The Texas Survey Commission, in its report of 1925, observed "that the actual amount of undesirable duplication is always less than many people suppose," thereby implying that some duplication is necessary and therefore desirable. Duplication is a relative term, and to distinguish between desirable and undesirable duplication involves more than a counting of noses. Duplication of the same type of institutions may initially be justified by the simple fact that the state is large and populous enough to support more than one. Even where this is not clearly demonstrable, there is something to be said for geographical separation if this results in great improvement in convenience and accessibility to student population. The expert must consider not only the cost of education to the taxpayer but also the cost to the student.

When it is proposed to pass judgment upon duplication of courses, departments and divisions, still other factors have to be taken into consideration. In the case of subjects which all or practically all college students have to take, such as English composition, elementary mathematics, American history and beginning courses in the laboratory sciences, duplication of facilities involves very little expense: if they were offered on one campus instead of on two or three, practically the same number of instructors and classrooms and the same amount of laboratory facilities would have to be provided. Assuming the existence of the separate institutions, any "extra" expense would thus not only be desirable but necessary. The situation is different, however, in the case of advanced or highly specialized courses for which there is only a limited demand. It is, generally speaking, wasteful to duplicate on two or three different campuses such expensive courses, if the normal combined enrolment in each of these courses could easily be accommodated at one institution.

But this is true only if the courses are not an essential part of the overall educational program of each institution. This important qualification applies not merely to individual courses but also to departments and even to whole divisions and colleges. The issue arises, invariably and characteristically, in states in which the university and the agricultural college are independent units and located on different campuses. One party contends, for example, that it is wasteful to have on the campus of the agricultural school a liberal arts college which duplicates that on the campus of the state university. The other party insists that without it the students of the agricultural school would be denied the essentials of a liberal education. It is amusing and enlightening to note that sometimes the same individuals advance both contentions, though, of course, at different times.

#### IV

In the analysis of duplication there is another important consideration which must be taken into account, namely, that increase in the size of an institution beyond a certain point results in the loss of desirable educational values or makes their realization much more difficult and uncertain. Impersonality and mechanization, which are the inevitable concomitants of great size, dehumanize the educational process and tend to widen the distance between student and teacher and generally increase the artificiality of university life. No better proof of the existence of these conditions can be found than the elaborate attempts in our universities to correct them by means of guidance, counselling and advisor systems.

As for the unwholesome competition and rivalry which some of the surveys exposed, reconsideration of the facts has also led to some qualifications and revisions. First of all, it is felt that both the spread and the intensity of the competitive feeling are for a large part a by-product of athletic competition, particularly of course, in football. The partisanship of most alumni, including some who are members of the state legislature, has no deeper and nobler source than that. The obvious cure for this is for the colleges to turn out wiser alumni—or to abolish intercollegiate football. Competition and rivalry have another and more serious source, however: the feeling that the state has not enough money

or student population to go around. Sometimes this is true and sometimes not. In either case, the feeling engenders the conviction that in the struggle for existence each institution must fend for itself. The high pressure atmosphere created by this conviction was considerably deflated in one state as a result of the agreement of the presidents of two rival institutions to accept as a fact, and to affirm publicly and privately, that the state could easily support the two institutions in the style to which they would like to become accustomed. With respect to competition between institutions, there is thus a growing conviction that if football rivalry is kept out of the picture, if a more optimistic and magnanimous attitude is taken by the institutions towards one another, if presidents will moderate their personal and official ambitions, and if legislatures will be somewhat more generous towards education, much of the unwholesomeness and bitterness in educational competition will disappear. Most of such competition as would remain would advance rather than retard education.

Professional discussion of the lack of standardization pointed out by the surveys has made it clear that this also is not an unmixed evil. It is unanimously agreed that procedures in the business and recording offices of state institutions should be uniform. There is strong objection on the part of some educators, however, to the enforcement of uniformity in standards of admission, promotion and graduation. It seems obvious enough that an institution ought to be free to raise its standards above the minimum established by accrediting agencies, in spite of occasional public resentment of such snobbishness or criticism from politicians who in typical demagogic style decry this as being "undemocratic." Freedom to deviate downward is another matter, however. It is somewhat startling to find it defended by some educators on the ground that it is the prescribed duty of the state regularly to provide higher education for those with one talent as well as for those with ten. Other educators insist that this deviation is temporarily justifiable in the case of some backward states which have not yet reached educational maturity. Unsympathetic objectors contend that such states should learn to walk before they attempt to run.

## V

The tendency to discount the censorious reports of existing malconditions in public education is not the most important product of a reconsideration of the survey reports by the more conservative critics. Far more significant is their unwillingness to approve of the corrective measures which are recommended. Almost all of these measures involve an increase in centralization of educational authority, and in this respect they reflect a common educational philosophy. In the opinion of some, they do far more: they reflect a common social and political trend. Whatever the case may be, to these measures there is vigorous objection on the part of those who are inclined to mistrust concentration of power.

These objectives do not, of course, categorically oppose all centralization. On the contrary, they are convinced that there can be no efficient administration of public education without it. But they are likewise convinced that there is a point at which increase in centralization becomes subject to the law of diminishing returns. From that point on, there is not only little if any further gain in economy, efficiency and other benefits, but there is actually a positive loss in the realization of the primary objectives of education. Although objectors are not agreed at what point a stop should be put to the increase of centralization, all are in emphatic agreement that the plan which vests control of the whole state system of public education in a single board lies considerably beyond the margin of safety. In fact, it is only one step short of the absolute limit, which is centralized federal control. Since the overall board represents the concrete extreme at the moment and since there seems to be a tendency on the part of many proponents of centralization to commend it, this plan is currently the focus of criticism.

Objections to this, as to other plans of centralization, are concerned both with its immediate effects on education and with its ultimate social and political consequences. An important objection, which comes principally from professional educators, contends that the overall board plan has gone the limit, to date, in removing the control of education as far as possible from those who are doing the educating. It is almost the last phase of the tendency described by J. E. Kirkpatrick as "the disappearance of the teaching group as a legal and authoritative person."



That the critics of this tendency are correct in interpreting it as an expression of a positive educational policy is demonstrated by some statements which constitute part of the credo of the Alabama Survey Commission. "Education," so states the report, "is a profession and should be conducted by professionally educated people, beginning with the lowest paid teacher and continuing to the highest paid executive." (However) "Educational policy should not be dominated by professional educators: the lay representatives of the people should have the final word." "The expert should be on tap but not on top." In conformance with these principles, the survey recommends the appointment of a professional educator, an "expert" (to be called the Superintendent of Education), as executive director of the overall lay board.

This does not make good sense to the critics. They insist that the sharp differentiation of the conduct of education and of educational policy is either mostly theory or mostly wrong. If by educational policy something more is meant than the mere allocation of funds, then such policy directly or indirectly covers the determination of what is to be taught, how it is to be taught, who is to do the teaching and many other fundamental questions. The lawyer, the banker and the manufacturer and their lay colleagues will have to decide, for example, whether or not the state agricultural college is to be allowed a department of fine arts. If they are simply going to accept the judgment of the expert, why not have the expert advise the appropriate committee of the legislature? Why interpose another board between the institutions' representatives and the representatives of the people? Certainly not in the hope that this will eliminate competition and pressure and maneuvering for funds. The legislature will not be bound to accept the recommendations of the board. Loyal alumni among the lawmakers and college presidents or their representatives will still be free to confer in smoke-filled rooms.

Critics of the overall board-cum-expert plan not only entertain doubts about the qualifications of the board members but they are none too sure about the "executive director." They doubt the existence of an educator who possesses the phenomenal wisdom necessary to give expert advice on every phase of public education. Nor are they greatly reassured by the provision that the



expert must be a "professional educator," for they have from time to time witnessed the instantaneous transformation of a banker, lawyer or politician, into a professional educator by the mere fact of appointment to the presidency of an institution of higher education.

A second objection comes from those who think it unwise to consolidate the administration of higher education and that of primary and secondary education. This objection comes principally from the administrators and professors of the colleges and universities. These authorities claim that the aims, procedures and problems of education on the college level are so much more complex and specialized than on the lower educational levels, that no single board is competent to administer them. The professors feel rather strongly on this subject. This feeling is in part the reflection of a long-standing feud between the high schools and the colleges over admission requirements. The college party claims that the high school graduates are inadequately prepared for college, and the high school party claims that the admission requirements of the colleges are narrow, unrealistic and generally stuffily academic. Since the high school party has always been the stronger numerically and politically, the college party feels that in any contest before an overall board on this issue, or on any other, higher education will get the worst of it; in fact, that ultimately the high school party will probably gain complete control of higher education. Although the situation under the separate control system is somewhat messy and irritating, the college party would prefer to continue fighting it out under the old rules. The old way, they say, is not only the fairer but also the more democratic way. Separate boards and divided authority provide the checks and balances which are essential and native to democracy.

## VI

It is concern for democracy, but with a much broader and deeper reference, that forms the basis for the most weighty objection to centralization. Opponents claim that such extreme concentration of authority as is exemplified in the single board plan makes political usurpation of the control of education much too easy. In justification of their claim, opponents of centralization call attention to past experiences and their implications. They

cite the cases of Mississippi and Georgia in which the politicians almost overnight brought the institutions into national disrepute, thanks to the handy machinery available in the form of the single board of higher education. They point to the instances of political usurpation of the control of the whole school system of a city, made easy by virtue of the centralization of power in a single board of education. They cite the well-known weakness of some of our politicians for extending their power through patronage and then call attention to the increase in temptation and promise presented by a highly centralized school system. They are also somewhat concerned about the more and more frequent appearance of a comparatively new type of educational administrator, the educator-politician, who seems to be a natural product of the association of education with politics, who seems to feed and grow on centralization, and who, as he develops, exhibits an unfortunate tendency to become more and more the politician and less and less the educator.

All the fears of the opponents of centralization thus clearly stem from one root, namely, the conviction that increase in centralization reduces the number and efficacy of the checks and balances which are provided by diffusion of educational authority. They are not impressed by the contentions of the moderate proponents of centralization that the availability of experts will prevent the demoralization of education; that legal safeguards such as specific definition of powers by statute can be provided to prevent political usurpation; that in education, as in other spheres of interest under governmental control, we must make reasonable allowance for integrity and goodwill in our public servants; and that, anyway, the voters can turn the politicians out if they prove to be rascals. For in the last analysis it is not some particular plan or degree of centralization that they fear; it is the political philosophy to which they suspect the radical proponents of centralization to be committed, the philosophy, namely, which affirms that in a democracy every institution must be kept as immediately responsive as possible to the public will and that therefore the administration of all tax-supported schools must be brought under the direction of the elected representatives of the people, namely, the governor and the members of the legislature.

To this the radical opponents of centralization oppose their own conception of democracy. According to this conception, the life of a political democracy depends upon the ability of such a democracy to correct itself by revising its social and economic institutions. Though its moral commitments are definite and final, its institutions and procedures must be experimental. To make such revision possible and effective there must be an informed electorate. Enlightenment of public opinion must necessarily depend in the last analysis on education. Education must therefore be free to criticize established procedures and institutions and to advocate such new ones as seem to promise a more effective realization of the objectives of democracy. Education must consequently also take an experimental attitude towards itself. Institutions of higher education particularly should be left free to develop in different directions. They will then not only better meet the varied educational demands of a democratic people but they will cover a wider range of inquiry and experimentation. Moreover, as in the world of experimental science, they will act as a system of checks and balances and will supplement and correct one another.

The preservation of the greatest possible measure of freedom in education is therefore absolutely essential to the continuance of the democratic system. The attainment of financial economy, administrative efficiency, peace and order on the educational front, comfort for our harassed governors and legislators, restraint of our too aggressive and ambitious college and university presidents, all these desirable objectives are far less important than the protection of our educational institutions from political control, even from benevolent control. A system of public education in which administrative authority is distributed over several independent boards rather than centralized in one board not only offers a more hospitable environment for freedom of inquiry and experimentation but also possesses a much higher degree of immunity from political interference in critical times. To jeopardize this freedom and this immunity by greater centralization would be the most dangerous mistake which the citizens of a democracy could make.

## PUBLIC AFFAIRS IN ASSEMBLY PROGRAMS

MYRON F. WICKE

DEAN, BALDWIN-WALLACE COLLEGE

POTENTIALLY one of the most valuable features of the liberal arts program, the college assembly (or chapel) is too frequently little more than an opportunity lost. In this respect the assembly shares the doubtful honor of neglect with the extra-curricular program of the average college. For what college exploits nearly to the full the educational values latent in extra-curricular activities?

The reasons for the failure of many assembly plans are generally two. First, they fail from lack of imagination and hard work. Like any other part of campus life, the benefits to be derived from assembly are in direct ratio to the work and thought given to it. The assembly program needs a hard-working director, a person who ought to be considered one of the major educational officers of the college, and at least of the rank of department head. His whole time might not be needed for the work, but surely most of it would be required. Given the time and the energy, imagination will show more and more opportunities. Again, most assembly programs suffer from lack of integration, with the result that they tend often to be piecemeal creations, with few unifying threads to tie them together into anything more than a spotty series of lectures. Like many college courses, assemblies often give the impression of being crazyquilts because they are a little of this and a little of that, piles of assorted information with no "big idea," no unifying principle.

It is the purpose of this paper to suggest what one part of the program might beneficially be. Other parts are surely quite as important, and perhaps even more so. Probably in a Christian liberal arts college the religious feature should have first emphasis. Even here, however, the need for more careful planning and continual hard work is obvious. Another part could doubtless be devoted profitably to the arts, especially to those most effectively practiced communally. The production of important plays for the entire student body in assembly; the presentation regularly of choral and orchestral student groups; and the use

of community singing of great but singable music—these are especially valuable. The third section, and the one to be emphasized here, might deal with public affairs.

There are many reasons why public affairs need official stress on a college campus. The ignorance of college students in this area is little short of a national scandal. Often so busy studying Plato and Shakespeare, the student has (he insists) no time to keep up to date on the affairs of his own government. And of all types of government his own, the democracy, is most susceptible to disease from indifference. The average college catalog usually indulges in glowing platitudes about the training of responsible citizens, but like many other features of college catalogs the "responsible citizen" line is subject to quiet questioning. If the student's ignorance of public affairs were only temporary it might not be so serious, but all too often it is complemented by a discouraging inertia, by a lack of alertness which may carry over long after graduation. In short, in the best educational years of their lives college students are often so busy that they fail to learn the fundamentals of responsible citizenship, among which not the least is the need for information. The college cannot afford to be a party to even a temporary blackout of interest in what the world is doing. It is not implied that the following suggestions will be a panacea for all the ills of social and political laziness. It is suggested, however, and most emphatically, that the college ought at least to create a situation in which public affairs *must* be considered.

That the college assembly is a good place for such discussion is obvious when one considers the makeup of the average student body. Here are joined students from many parts of the country. They are young men and women from various social levels—sons and daughters of the wealthy, of the poor, of the artist, of the laborer. Also there are gathered here many nationality groups and several races. Probably at no later time in their lives will students be part of so cosmopolitan a group.

Again, since the college assembly is made up of a selected group of men and women, with more or less common objectives, discussion can be intelligent and forthright. The eagerness which students bring to such discussions has more than once astonished adults who have assumed, as do too many educators,



that students learn only by hearing lectures from experts. The public affairs assemblies can become an interesting approximation of the New England Town Meeting.

One or two specific suggestions for the arrangement of these meetings may make the possibilities more clear. First of all, the public affairs hours should not become only lectures by important political figures. These are valuable, but they should be used in a limited way. The public affairs assemblies should be primarily laboratories in which the students do the talking, but only after careful guidance and after careful planning. A section of the year's program should be devoted to legislative assemblies, in which the entire student body is arranged as a legislative body, gathered to discuss and finally vote on bills of current importance. The bills should be prepared by students, perhaps in political science or speech classes, and should be printed in advance for consideration in speech, history, political science, or English classes. The whole campus attitude must show that the public affairs laboratory is important. In conducting the meetings students must be taught to follow rules of order scrupulously. Microphones on the platform and at least one on the floor of the auditorium are essential.

Other parts of the public affairs laboratory should include panel discussions, debates and forums. Again it is mainly important that as far as possible students do the talking, though a great deal of counseling and guidance will be needed. From time to time a visiting lecturer may be called in to throw additional light upon a knotty problem. Subjects should be currently relevant and important.

A fair portion of these assemblies ought to be devoted to student government and to faculty-student relationships. It is a truism that students are eager for self-government, but quite unwilling to accept the attendant responsibilities. Nevertheless, the best opportunity for learning responsibility is to find it and study it where the student is. A campus which offers little opportunity for true self-government is failing in its job. Most campus misunderstandings regarding college policies arise out of a lack of accurate information, and when administrative officials are willing to discuss campus problems with the students, these misunderstandings rarely assume the proportion of major



problems. The give-and-take of opinion between students and administration can be managed without loss of dignity by either group. There will of course be embarrassments, but these must be accepted as part of the wear-and-tear of the learning process.

The assembly must be re-evaluated by the colleges. A vital program demands more time, more work, and more imagination. It will not demand much more money, for such a program, largely of student talent, will cost a good deal less in fees for speakers, and this will compensate at least in part for the expense of a director. Lectureships on a college campus are extremely valuable, and if they are not to be held as part of the assembly program they may be maintained in other ways. But in the plan proposed, the doer is the learner, and the doer is the student.

I believe we should have much less difficulty in gaining attendance at assembly hours if it were clearly understood that the assembly plan is an integral part of the student's education. Whether credit should be allowed for attendance is a less crucial matter than that something important be accomplished. And much of importance is possible.

Tentative and partial efforts of the sort outlined here have been tried with more than a little success in at least one liberal arts college, a co-educational school of about 800 students. One of the legislative assemblies, dealing with compulsory military training, was recorded on the campus by a metropolitan radio station and broadcast on a Saturday evening following. The recording gave clear evidence that intelligent, thoughtful students are interested, even fascinated, by good public affairs discussions. Students always listen more willingly to their own peers, when—and this is the crucial matter—they have something to say and can say it passing well. This demands, of course, close attention by the faculty, or rather by *someone* on the faculty who likes students and who wants to see them grow.

## THE MEANING OF SCHOLARSHIP FOR TODAY

ORDWAY TEAD

CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION, NEW YORK CITY

**WE ARE** here this morning to glorify the American scholar. But before we can adequately do that we have surely to identify him or her. Are we thinking of the undergraduate as a scholar? Are we thinking of the faculty in their role as scholars? Or are we conceiving of some type of individual embodying certain qualities and paying our respects to that more idealized conception?

This last, more general conception was expressed with brilliant success one hundred and eight years ago in an address entitled "The American Scholar" by one Ralph Waldo Emerson, and his utterance makes every subsequent effort to glorify true scholarship seem derivative and inadequate. That paper deserves periodic rereading at the hands of us all. It crackles with modernity as if it were this morning's newspaper.

And the nub of the whole matter as there set forth is that the role of the scholar and of scholarship has to be seen in relation to the world of affairs in a way that needs continuing reemphasis if the world of books and of ideas is to be kept alive, alert and relevant to all of life.

Let us, to sharpen the sense of a new meaning for scholarship, first identify what scholarship is *not* in the appraisal of today. For yesterday's notion of it made scholarship so unappealing to normal, red-blooded undergraduates that even when they acquired a  $\Phi$  B K key they often would not wear it.

Scholarship is no longer the knowledge of more and more about less and less. It is no longer the mere accumulation of factual detail in some discipline or subject. It is not the capacity to couch simple ideas in five-syllabled, ten-dollar words that look impressive and are often obscure. It is not bibliographical skill in knowing where inert ideas or facts can be located. It is not the whole apparatus of what goes with getting the Ph.D. and thus having the pedigree or union card which admits one to the ranks of college teachers.

NOTE: An address delivered at Scholarship Day, Massachusetts State College, November 29, 1945.

Indeed, it is not solely that which may be present when one has high marks and qualified for  $\Phi$  B K. Prominence in scholarship and high marks may go along together; they often do; but they do not necessarily. For scholarship is unfortunately not that which is recorded in the usual marking system—necessary though it is for us to have marking systems and for each of us as students to do well in our marks.

Speaking now positively, scholarship—whether of student or of teacher—is supposed, in our generally accepted understanding, to have something to do with excellence, with exacting standards of performance, with achievement in the mastery of ideas, with capacity to impart and render attractive the account of the special field of understanding which one has as scholar.

And it is out from this qualitative emphasis that the more complete and necessary conception derives, which I want here to clarify.

I shall maintain that as of our day scholarship can and should be a common possession of both teachers and students. It is an activity essential to society which the university and college are especially charged to cherish. It is a kind and quality of intellectual effort that are more required today than ever before. It is hopefully nurtured by the college but it is to be practiced everywhere.

Scholarship has to do with insight into significant relationships of ideas or of facts. It has to do with a combination of the intensive and the extensive look at data which has human importance. It is concerned to be at the same time deep and broad in its attack on vital subject matter. Its drive is toward establishing what is valuable, what is meaningful and significant in discrete areas of human experience. In true scholarship the overview is as important as are the minutiae. There is a dialectic that goes deliberately and consciously back and forth from generalization to fact and from particular idea to principle. And we call those fixated on the facts, pedants, not scholars.

In any sense adequate for today's distress, your scholar is thus a philosopher. He is concerned to establish, to clarify, to secure appreciation for, some special body of knowledge because it helps to a better grasp of the whole of man's world. The problem of unity in diversity, of the one and the many, is every scholar's

problem. In a world and in an age so surfeited with facts as ours is, to relate the particular to the general becomes essential. If the scholar seems to have forgotten how to view matters under the aegis of eternity, that boon, too, has to be restored to him.

Also, the scholar is to be distinguished from the researcher. Scholarship may grow out of research, may be built on research; but it is of another essence. It has to do with placing the *value* of the research and the meaning and significance of the findings. Scholarship includes the capacity to be wisely evaluative as one of its most vital attributes.

And if this is so, the whole problem of deriving and affirming values becomes an integral part of the scholar's role. Where shall he find the criteria and standards in the light of which values are established and advanced? Indeed, it is impossible to derive the meaning of scholarship without eagerly acknowledging that we are talking about the basis on which any evaluation of intellectual activity should take place. Scholarship degenerates to the tortuous turns of the bookworm unless a rigorous sense for what is valuable is present. On this score I venture to propose for your consideration that the valuable is whatever will ameliorate and ennoble the quality of human living. Scholarship is a social enterprise for an end at once social and personal. And the values which it is assuming, is being critical about, and is trying to help realize, are those having to do with men's effort to build a good society of worthful persons.

The effort toward a shared companionship striving for the good life in a beloved and unlimited community gives us something of an evaluative criterion. Scholarship is the zealous intellectual project which drives forward on that beam of direction.

I have now characterized scholarship as a certain kind of total attitude and effort. And I shall next point out why this definition is not just personal, nor deductively arrived at, nor arbitrarily wishful.

At what facet of today's life do you choose to look?

Are you distressed and urgent about a strong supernatural government? About the confusions of national operations at Washington? About the stresses and strains of the relations of corporations and labor unions?

Or are you interested in our control of nature, in food supply,

in utilization of material resources, in mechanical power and new technological applications?

Or are you exercised about illness and suffering, about the increase of those with mental diseases and of those being divorced, about the tensions in personal relationships in a complex society?

Or, finally, are you anxious that people's powers of esthetic response and appreciation shall be heightened, that they shall enjoy finer books, plays, movies, music and all the rest, and shall be encouraged to create and to perform in one or another of the arts?

I have suggested four big areas of human activity—political-economic, scientific, personal relations and esthetic. In no one of these areas can there be improvement in the quality of life, in our capacity to grapple successfully with events, if we have no scholars to illuminate the problem and help guide those who would mobilize for the attack.

Each of these kinds of human adjustment requires the presence and agency of many men and women who have the scholarly approach as here defined. We have to relate local to world forces and factors; we have to see public interests rising above special interests; we have to see the relations of scientific results to economic action, and to esthetic satisfactions. We have to determine what is valuable to do among the things we might do. In short, we have to have a large injection of scholarship into public affairs and into personal relationships.

If this sounds like a plea for some new, bigger and better "brain trust," that will not be too inaccurate. For I am talking about an extension of more and better brains into more and more critical areas of public and personal affairs. The only trouble with brain trusters is that they have been too few, too temporary in tenure, and too haphazard as to the positions they held and the matters they were concerned with. Indeed, scholarship is a reality when each man has become in some measure his own brain trust.

I am glad in this connection to note that the record of college faculty members who have been on leave in a great variety of war services, has been so brilliant. Those who have gone from the academy to the marketplace have done well as men of thought in action. We have shown that we had more potential scholars

than we guessed. There have been scores of posts for which professors were sought in larger numbers than they existed because, due to their academic association, they were uniquely able to sense and stand for a public interest as against some more limited and selfish interest.

Yes, the scholar of today is, as Emerson said, "Man thinking," thinking keenly and devotedly about the progression toward a good society, thinking so clearly and to the point that any sharp cleavage between thought and action breaks down. "The true scholar" Emerson added, "grudges every opportunity of action passed by, as a loss of power." "Action" he said, "is with the scholar subordinate, but it is essential. Without it, he is not yet man. . . . Only so much do I know, as I have lived."

Let not this pragmatic emphasis, however, be taken too narrowly. Reference to braintrusters connotes politics and the social sciences. I am not saying that scholarship equates with public service. I am not saying that scholarship equates with professional training to make money in some useful career. I am not saying that scholarship has to focus on subjects of *obvious* social significance to justify itself. I am not saying that the expansive and playful activity of the reason, imagination and intuition on matters not directly or obviously practical, which disclose their own inner harmonies and fascinations, is not meritorious. Disinterested inquiry leading where it will in its conclusions and on topics seemingly far from the marketplace in interest, should not be denied its place in college. I am not trying to restrict the curious mind nor to put blinders on its vision. But much *does* depend on the spirit and motive animating the devotion of the inquiring student.

Let me say it, again, in still other words. Scholarship is the profound vitalizing of one's thinking to be fruitful and illuminating about how man adjusts better to his world. Scholarship is the eager drive toward rational manipulation of every kind of human problem looking toward their solution.

Scholarship is the effort to have experience more orderly, more rich, more meaningful, more directed, because of the zeal with which the interrelations of subjects have been examined. It is thinking men ready and able to act appropriately to demonstrate a valid and valuable relation between their ideas and their con-



duct. It is meaningful relatedness of *thinking* experience and *acting* experience. It is thought and imaginative vision being relevant to areas of human confusion.

And because scholarship means for us relevancy, reflective power toward action, mastery of recalcitrant or disorderly materials, another truth about the new scholarship follows from this—namely, that its substance changes from generation to generation. Each day and age asks new questions about its past, its traditions, its state of scientific knowledge. Different problems beset us; and what history or economics or philosophy read like to those of 1850 or 1900, no longer seems pertinent to our concerns. We may read the same books, but we take different lessons from them.

In fact, each generation of true scholars is embarked upon a reexamination of the particular field of study with the question in mind: "What does all this mean to us *now*?" And it is in answering this question that new histories, new philosophies and new literary criticism get written by successive generations of scholars.

And in the field of scientific subject matter a new generation of scholars is asking new questions derived from the partial answers with which the previous generation presented us. Indeed we have to realize that the very essence of the scientific method—in its application in more and more fields—assumes a reshaping of conditions, a dynamic interfering with surroundings, a manipulation of causal factors materially and socially, all of which alter the old hypotheses about the play of forces upon human beings.

We are confronted not merely by the play of known, causative, historic forces; but by the injection into them of man-made influences such as the whole technological revolution in factory and farm. And scholarship implies and requires both familiarity with the use of the new methods and with the conditioning influences they have set in motion. Moreover, an environment in which we consciously do or can control the rate of change in vital factors cries aloud for a kind of scholarship which has not only its scientific but its ethical dynamism. If the habit of changing habits has to some degree become a valued intellectual attribute, the scholar has to take full account of that partial truth.

Now that we have hopefully arrived at some sense of what scholarship is, it should be worthwhile to state some of the sup-

porting ideas and preconceptions in and through which it is assured of its real vitality. With what premises of operation do we today help scholarship most fully into being? I shall refer to the following:

1. The new scholarship depends upon a sound view of how all learning occurs.

2. It depends upon a realistic faith that ideas can count and be partially controlling; that rationality is worth pursuing.

3. It depends upon a practical sense that we do live in a universe, that we are of one world, that the unity of its working is discoverable in realms of thought and feeling which include the subject matter of all the disciplines.

4. It depends upon the existence of a strong sense of personal responsibility possessed by each scholar,—a strong compulsion to use reasoning and science, to use intellectual power, for a public good.

5. And finally, the new scholarship acknowledges with refreshing candor that the rational processes are not the only avenues to truth and wisdom, that non-rational methods of disclosure to the human spirit do exist, that the testimony of artist, seer, prophet and saint is conclusive that new insights and new visions are made flesh and dwell among us and are known in the living rather than in the thinking.

I must be content with only a further word or two on these five points which I have selected to remind us of some of the conditions which have to be present—present in institutions of higher learning and in individual minds and hearts—if the scholar is to register as he should—if ideas and action are to fuse and interpenetrate as they must if the scholar is to be justified.

The nature of learning is still too easily ignored and denied by educators. Learning is not a process of being told, nor is it remembering verbalisms—not merely the capacity to name a fact or give facile expression to an idea. Learning is the capacity to think, feel, express and act appropriately in regard to a body of subject matter, or a problem situation of any kind. Learning is learning to use—the incorporation of a total inroad of new experience which makes a difference, into the mental, nervous, physical structure of the person.

Learning thus implies action; it implies suitable feeling; it implies that what has been learned is now an integral part of the learner in a dynamic, propulsive way. What this has to say about the inadequacy of the usual methods of college instruction, I leave you to fill in. Surely one reason we do not develop more of these new scholars is that we do not provide ourselves with enough real learning experience in college.

Let me pass over my second point about the operative value of ideas in life, in the hope that you already agree with me that ideas can be influential. And turn to my third point, that the modern scholar will insist on trying to live in a *universe*. Whether we look at the vast particularities of physical scientific knowledge, at the social relativities in comparative anthropology, at the strongly developed separations of race, nation, color and creed, at every other conceivable factor that divides our world into little, unrelated bits, the human spirit's cry for some first principles or last principles of unification under which to view a pluralistic universe, is today more profound than ever.

The unity of knowledge, the viewing of life through one frame, may seem today no reality at all. But the sense that it can be so, and is already more and more possible, is a rightful attribute of the scholar who would keep his mental moorings and his spiritual sanity. The finding of our way back out of scattered knowledge to wisdom is one of the scholar's clear assignments.

If any one word underscores the modern scholar's mandate, it is the word—*responsibility*. Every lesson of World War II seems to go back to and stem from the sense of responsibility which men of thought in different lands did or did not have in relation to social action in the years after 1918. The quality of the scholar's moral touchstone, of his emotional bias and drive, and of his ethical imperative, has now become one of the most important things to ask about him. As political isolationism is suicidal for nations, mental isolationism is suicidal for individuals and scholars. The scholar is man thinking on behalf of human betterment—a responsibility inescapable and urgent.

From whence the inescapable and urgent nature of this responsibility ultimately derives, it is not possible adequately here to consider. The ultimate sanctions under which the scholar lives, the basic metaphysics or first principles he is to espouse—these

matters have to do with and bear upon the extent of his capacity to see more in life than meets the senses, to share in using power which is more than rational and to manifest a fraternal love which reaches out to become universal.

The scholar has his heart interests and he has his sensitivities to beauty. He is man thinking with a warm heart and eager to be enriched with the visions of the supernal which all fine art invokes. Nor is he today to be any longer mentally circumscribed by the accidents of locality. Into the universe of his thought has to come acknowledgment of religions, theologies, manners, customs and cultural values, which may flatly contradict his presently held philosophy. If the religions of the East urge serenity, tranquillity, self-renunciation and transcendence of the material world, the scholar has somehow to rise above the horizons of his parish in order to come into the same world of discourse with adherents of those other religions and cultures. That the preconceptions, standards and aspirations of the West are the only ones possible for humans to hold, is obviously false; and the new scholar will strive for a more discerning and more inclusive orientation to the Orient.

One other neglected factor in the modern, too-rationalized approach to our own self-knowledge requires mention. I refer to that doubtful doctrine which is popularly phrased by saying that to know the good is to do the good.

The relation of the scholar's intention to his performance, of his insight to his courage, of his vision to his drive to realize the vision—these are all factors vital to the fruition of scholarship. They all have to do with the reality of human shortcomings and inadequacies. They have to do with acknowledgment that sin is a fact.

I shall quote a recent volume on this score in order to make my point as quickly as possible. In his new book "The Liberal Tradition," Professor W. A. Orton of Smith College says:

Deterministic theories, sociological and psychological, are popular because they offer people a plausible excuse to go on fooling themselves and ignoring or denying their own experience. It is a simple fact—and everybody knows it—that when we refuse to fulfill the demands of our higher nature a sense of failure and remorse besets us; we feel and know that we have sinned and come short of the glory of

God. Since this feeling is uncomfortable, an age that has made a god of comfort will not admit it; it is barred as far as may be from consciousness, and the word sin is banished from polite usage. Instead, we invent all sorts of elaborate disguises for the fact to which it refers. A deterministic dogma comes in very handy as an escape from responsibility. Sociology proffers a variety of comfortable excuses for human failure. You can blame the "environment," the "culture," your "hormones," "the subconscious"—you can blame, in short, almost anything except yourself; because you have been taught that you really have no self. If there is a quicker way to weaken the moral fiber of a democracy, it has yet to be discovered; for in all these subterfuges the root impulse is to escape the more exacting and uncomfortable aspects of human responsibility, individual and collective. Catholics, as individuals, know how hard (and how salutary) it is to utter a sincere *mea culpa*. . . . A return to sanity and realism requires that men be made to face the fact, and the consequences, of their own wrongdoing before they deal with that of other people.

My point about the non-rational factors in reality of which the scholar has to be more aware, thus relates closely to the problem of how we all hold ourselves to our own best and get back on the track of it when we have gone astray. For no account to be taken, in short, within the frame of modern scholarship, of the role of those universal and inevitable experience which used to be called sin, repentance and redemption—would be a blindness hard to account for.

This discussion of some of the major premises of modern scholarship should logically be followed in conclusion by some hints about the educational program which would seem to promise to produce the kind of scholars we are here favoring. For obviously the scholars of tomorrow will be those students of today who become able by the right kind of education to wed thought to action relevantly on urgent problems of all sorts.

Time fails for the full mention of such a program. I shall be content with a few assertions which I offer for your consideration.

1. Every modern scholar should have been exposed to a vivid documentation of the admittedly important experiences of the past as represented in the best thought of the social sciences, the natural sciences and the humanities.



2. These should be so offered and presented with different kinds of learning appeal so that the non-verbalizing student really learns them.

3. The use of field work, summer work, project work of every conceivable kind, should be incorporated into every student's curriculum in order to clinch, to deepen and to broaden the learning experience. There is no inherent reason why the usual C student, who is not thought of as a scholar either by himself or the college, should not qualify for this newer type of scholarship—if only we solve the problem of putting the educational offering before that student in ways which arouse his curiosity, touch his interests and draw on his non-verbal talents.

4. The undergraduates' "major" while emphasizing mastery and thoroughness should not be too narrow in field or subject.

5. Specifically vocational courses of the "how to do it" variety should be deferred until the later years of college. Rather, the general and the vocational aims of every course should be made clear, vertically up through the four years. Vocational training only contributes to scholarship when it is rooted in a grasp of general knowledge and an understanding of that wisdom which makes men free.

6. The college period is too short a time in which to get enough education to carry one through life. Hence a primary purpose should be to help everyone to *learn how to learn* and equally to *want to keep on learning* on their own account. Adult education, formal and informal, is an essential part of any plan to assure more and better scholars.

7. Finally, there is no escaping the fact that thinking, excellence, mastery, achieving relatedness among subject matters—these are *hard work*. To be the modern scholar is to be possessed of that "noble tension" upon which, as G. B. Shaw has pointed out, all achievement is based.

Hence the student needs every possible support to transform himself into the scholar. This occasion of Scholarship Day is meant to be such a support. And every day in every way the atmosphere of the institution has to be supercharged in order to give glory and honor and esteem to those who wrestle creatively with the life of the mind as it confronts the world of living men.



It is exciting and exhilarating—it can be the most zestful adventure in the world—to be the modern scholar. But it will help greatly if that adventure has the impassioned support of the group with whom one associates from day to day—the support of the “college body.”

This concludes my glorification of the American scholar. I only hope you have each seen yourself in this vital role and realized that I have not been talking about some “greasy grind” or stoop-shouldered book addict.

I have rather been trying to say that in our land is a job to do—a job of ordering our common life and our personal lives nearer to the heart’s desire.

To do that job requires a zeal for constructive action born of thought which sheds light upon the present out from the past. That effort at relevancy in penetrating use of the mind with all the historic resources it can focus upon the here and now, *is the new scholarship.*

It is the dedication of the highest quality of intellectual and moral capacity to the service of the beloved and unlimited community.

Scholarship, far from having to be apologized for, the scholar, far from being the kind of person to avoid being<sup>2</sup>—these have to be multiplied many fold.

A democracy has verily to put its trust in these. It has to stake its future on the new scholar and his vibrant scholarship.

It has to stake its future in *you!*

## CHERISHING AND CREATING THE CHRISTIAN AND DEMOCRATIC TRADITION IN A LIVING WORLD SOCIETY

KENNETH IRVING BROWN  
PRESIDENT, DENISON UNIVERSITY

### I

**T**HE Christian and democratic traditions to which we are all heir are founded, as has been said many times, on the cosmic significance of the individual man and woman. These great traditions see humanity as individual personalities, not slaves of the state, but important each in his own right. That has been said many times. At the moment, however, education stands in need of a word of caution spoken against excessive individualism.

We of the educational guild are great jokesters. We love our somewhat obscurantist humor. All might be well except that sometimes we believe our own brand of "funny" funny stories. We even maintain our pose of solemnity and our mood of dignified quizzicalness when we read the pleasant fiction of our college catalogues.

One of our little jokes that we have told the public repeatedly is that we cut our educational cloth to fit the individual needs of our individual students. Now, to some extent we do. The premedic student is given a premedic course. The student who wants to be a high school teacher takes practice teaching. But to a very much larger extent we do not individualize education, and moreover, we do not intend to, at least we do not intend to in the manner which the gullible public thinks we mean to when we use that inviting phrase in our commencement addresses.

We do not intend to, for one of the wants of our day is a larger and more binding sense of community. Both faculty members and college students need to develop deeper insight into the adventure and obligation of community living, not with an obliteration of the rich and priceless contribution which individual differences can make but with a larger and more welcome acceptance of the bonds and the obligations and even the limitations of communal experience.

NOTE: Address given at the Inauguration of President John Gordon Howard, Otterbein College, Westerville, Ohio, November 3, 1945.

I am not meaning to throw out the window the legitimate application of the theory of individualized education. I should, however, like to smash the badly tarnished halo that the phrase has been sporting and to suggest the importance of the other side of the counter idea of education for community welfare.

The college campus is a family group. Like the family, some members are wise and some are ignorant, some go to bed early, and rise early, some go to bed late, and some maybe not at all. The Christian church is a family group; the town or the city has the potential of a family group. During the war the outreach of our patriotism made our country a family. And in peace there are a few wise, adventuring souls who dare to see in the whole world the making of one family.

Early man initiated youth into the tribe and when that day came that the young man put aside the freedom and the irresponsibility of boyhood to become a man and a member of his tribal group, there was a new recognition of responsibility that was on him. Civilized man has no comparable rite and the loss is ours. The necessity of conscription and defense of one's country might conceivably have been made an initiation into community life, but instead, it has become to a large extent the imposition of external compulsion without compensating realization of contribution to the larger good. Perhaps in our hearts we understand but our young Americans greatly fear the word or the act which has the slightest flavor of the mock-heroic. The privilege of voting when one is twenty-one is too often a choice made with regard solely to one's own personal convenience rather than an obligation willingly accepted for the good of the whole. Much of our community life divides rather than unites; it is undertaken as personal whim and pleasure rather than a necessary and expected obligation.

Here then is a strong argument for the core-courses and the basic curricular requirements which many colleges have added, that there might be a common body of knowledge held conceivably by all members of a campus community, a wealth of common intellectual experience.

Say, if you please, that this is individualized education and that every individual has need of a mastery of English grammar, some minimum ability as a public speaker, an acquaintance with

the broad outlines of world history and especially American history, some understanding of the phenomena of science and its methods, of the undergirding principles of economics and psychology—say it is individualized education, for the individual needs just this—Joe and Jane, Betty and Bob. But why not be honest and say that these are community needs, these insights and understandings, and that the curricular changes are intended for the strengthening of those ties that unite man to man?

If we are to cherish and nurture the Christian and democratic traditions of our society, our colleges of liberal arts must give increased attention to the building of this sense of responsibility for communal welfare, this acceptance of obligations even at the expense of individual freedom.

## II

Trumbull used to define a teacher as one who causes others to know. Thoughtful definition indeed, but incomplete, and in that incompleteness lies the mystery of the college divided against itself. For there are many who must insist that a teacher is one who causes others to want to know and to want to do. Our American people must be able to look to the university for the intellectual clarity of leadership—of course, that is essential and imperative. But in addition to intellectual clarity there must be a compelling vision of a world in need and the moral courage and the spiritual insight to do something—something in line with that intellectual clarity.

And right there is where our American education breaks into two opposing camps. There are those who insist that the knowledge and the love of knowledge, truth and its passionate pursuit, the intellectual virtues—that these are in and of themselves the sum-total of a college's objectives. Others would answer, "All this to be sure, but more."

In addition to knowledge and its love, to truth and its passionate pursuit, in addition to the intellectual virtues, let there be an honest effort to insist on the act of translating: of translating knowledge of political science into good citizenship, of translating the knowledge of science into the patient persistence of research, of translating the fine arts into our own little efforts of creativity, of translating the lessons of history into an honest and

intelligent try at making peace secure and workable today—and one more, of translating the everlasting God into the acts of everyday life.

Such an objective as this demands the kind of teacher who in addition to the mastery of his subject matter possesses a rich sympathy for college students, and a passion for righteousness both civic and personal, national and international. He must teach, he must inspire; he must invite to knowledge and furthermore strengthen the will to use knowledge; he must warm the emotions by which man persists in difficulty and against opposition.

Let there be no less emphasis on the things of the disciplined and informed mind. But, let it recognize that in deifying the mind as so often we have in our colleges, we have isolated ourselves from the living society of our day.

Dr. Hocking has named the chief defect in our contemporary education as the fact that our education "produces so many stunted wills, wills prematurely gray and incapable of greatness not because of lack of endowment but because they have never been exposed to what is noble, generous, and faith-provoking."

And at once the question comes before us, "How?"

It means a teaching which shall not blind the classroom to the major strengths or the major defects in our contemporary society. The Christian college, like the Christian church, has too generally soft-pedalled "the revolutionary criticism of society which is implicit in Christianity." In the years ahead, I anticipate as some of you do increasing pressure on the college to avoid those areas of economics and political science and history which remind the student of current injustice, pressure to overlook the moral and political and economic slum areas of our American life. And against that pressure the colleges must stand forthright and strong.

One answer to our "How?" comes in a series of visitors from all corners of the globe representing the great areas of human achievement that their spirit—the spirit of their doing may stir and possess the spirit of our men and women on campus.

In line with this there is necessity for the college to give praise, not alone to the achievements of mind, but to the achievements of life wherein thought brings conviction which results in intelligent action.

We are all aware of recent studies of the college men and women. One such report, "They Went to College," presented a cross-section of men and women from one of our mid-Western universities, and those of us who read it freed our hearts from scorn for we saw there too close a resemblance to campus groups we knew firsthand. The picture was not one to encourage educators. It showed the average college man and woman going back to his home town disinterested in civic needs, lax about his voting privileges, unaware of the church, insulated and isolated from international problems, content with a reading menu of Popeye and the tabloid newspaper. If this be our best achievement, the American public, the American public which has so generously supported American education, has been duped. In a day of decision like ours, it is not enough for "nice boys and girls to have a nice time under the supervision of nice men and women in a nice environment."

Eyes that see clearly and hands that have no fear of hard work; minds courageous and informed and a spirit that wills to move forward—should not these be accomplishments of our "baccalaureus artium," a part of the "rights and privileges and responsibilities appertaining thereto?"

### III

Underlying the American Christian college of the type which Otterbein represents are two basic fundamental assumptions. Now an assumption is a foundation on which collectively a group of men agree to build without persistent questioning lest by that questioning progress in the building shall be *nil*. And yet should ever the time come that the assumption is seriously doubted, then questioning cannot be avoided.

The two assumptions underlying the American Christian college are: The rightness of Christianity and the desirableness of democracy. These are basic assumptions. They are embracing arms which support even while they contain, and because they are there, there is the obligation on the part of the educator to see that the heritage of Christianity and the heritage of democracy are interpreted in and through the entire academic process and pattern.

We shall always be attempting to increase our understanding



of Christianity, to comprehend more fully and more wisely the Christian faith, to apprehend and to appropriate more fully the Christian heritage. Within the framework we may disagree widely among ourselves. Together, however, we would accept the assumption of the basic rightness of Christianity.

Likewise with the assumption of democracy. Fully aware we may be that its working practices have been imperfect, that theory differs widely from actuality. Men have used democracy to their own selfish advantage. Nevertheless, there is in our hearts a triumphant faith that in the theory of democracy we have the best groundwork for government which the human mind has been able to devise. So we accept the premise determined to improve its working practices, to find out more completely its implications.

The emphasis I would make is this, that a college in its family gatherings and its extra-curricular activities has the obligation of pointing out the implications of Christianity and democracy in and to every area of human knowledge. We should endeavor not alone to know the faith by which we live politically and religiously, but also to keep that faith vigorous.

Any quarrel we may have is not with secular education, certainly not with those institutions which by common concern must restrict the areas of their influence. Our quarrel is with ourselves that as Christian educators we have not done a better job in the area of our boasting. Too often we have encouraged the kind of psychological atheism where the individual has no center for life or purpose or affection. He is at loose ends, we say. Our college program has failed to give him the unity he so sorely needs. And in his psychological atheism he becomes a challenge.

Sometimes we have spoken glibly of spiritual values with so little comprehension of the meaning of our words and so little attention to those interests "which lift us out of ourselves, which give us the possibility of something generous, audacious, heroic, sacrificing in our attitude toward the needs of the world." For if Bertram Russell be right in this our day, "the good are lazy and only the bad are energetic and our modern world goes reeling, drunkenly, toward destruction."

In a college based upon assumptions of Christianity and democracy there can be no one single department to which is dele-

gated the responsibility for religion. Every department and every division must accept some concern. A Christian emphasis in a curriculum does not mean that any department goes outside its field to expound that of which the teacher is ignorant. Rather each teacher digs more deeply within his own mastered area of study to discover for himself and for his students some of those implications of his area for Christianity and democracy, implications which only intense and persistent study will disclose. Is there a single course in our curricula which is without relationships to the faith of Christianity and the practice of democracy? I know of none. Science, the social studies, the humanities, the fine arts—none is without its implications for a living world society founded on Christian and democratic principles.

Our day of discontent and national uncertainty can be a day of new opportunity. Our colleges one and all face a perplexing future. Our task is to build sturdy intellectual foundations, to encourage a fearless search for and examination of truth, and to demand on behalf of the community that the individual shall with equal courage apply such truth and understanding as may be his, cherishing and creating the Christian and democratic traditions in a living world society. We face and accept that task.

## SHOULD WE HAVE COMPULSORY TRAINING?

RUSSEL N. SQUIRE

PROFESSOR OF MUSIC, GEORGE PEPPERDINE COLLEGE

Freedom is a matter of degrees. There is danger, for those who have not been "immunized by experience," in the smoothness of transition through the successive stages from freedom to loss of freedom. Great catastrophies, like the fall of Rome, do not come in one spectacular crash but by a "smooth tobogganing down the slope" which may last centuries or only decades.—Adapted from Arthur Koestler, in the "Yogi and the Commissar," the Macmillan Company.

IN OUR time a compulsory year's training "of some sort" to be enforced upon young Americans is being proposed. While all of us are eager to sacrifice what privileges may usually be ours in order to win the peace we must be on our guard against unwisely deciding upon future sacrifices which may prove to be not only needless, or ineffectual, but even harmful.

### SHOULD THE TRAINING BE COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING?

If we decide to have compulsory military training how shall we insure that the training will not have become obsolete if the need of meeting another war emergency does arise? The smattering of compulsory military training that some of us were given in peacetime after the last war would not have been of much value in this war, surely, if we had been called to serve. Still, the military authorities of our land are insisting that the compulsory training we should have should be *pure military* training designed to prepare young people for real warfare. They seem to have no fear that the proposed training which they recommend will become outmoded. What steps can be taken to insure against obsolescence?

How shall we insure that the military training will not be attended by the usual moral and emotional breakdowns? Someone may answer that because this training is to be given in time of peace the usual antisocial conditions will not obtain. Such answer would betray only an instance of wishful thinking. The war we have just come through was not being waged in our land, yet the most regrettable social evils arose and are arising out of

the socially unhealthy military situation. Even in the period long before Pearl Harbor, a time of peace for this country, we, all of us, could see on every hand in public places the printed announcements which told the boys where to go for prophylactic treatment. Does this not furnish us an index of what we should have to insure against in a future peacetime compulsory military training?

How shall we insure that the military training, or any kind of compulsory training, will not hamper seriously the professional training so necessary to the welfare of our young people and to the welfare of our nation as a whole? Is it not true that even in normal times preprofessional people are handicapped seriously because of the length of time which their training demands? This necessary long training prevents marriage at normal times, prevents earning of income, indeed necessitates serious expenditure up to the age of 27, 28, or 30 years. To say nothing of making this period of professional training longer, compulsory training, military or otherwise, would interrupt the period and disrupt seriously the *continuity* of study necessary to successful professional training.

Someone may point to those advantages now provided by the military services in which they give to those in the forces who are suitably qualified complete medical training, *et cetera*. It might be urged that such be done in peacetime. There are some interesting points in respect to this which should be studied. In time of peace, if the military services are going to provide, for example, medical training, are they going to provide such training for all who qualify academically or only for those who *also* can qualify physically? There are many persons whose ability in the professions is superior but who for physical reasons cannot qualify for military service. If the military should undertake to provide certain men under a compulsory-peace-time-training-program with professional training, would the *rejectees* have to pay their own bill while some fine physical specimens, maybe with not as great ability, would have their training paid for with a salary thrown in extra?

In case a plan of specialized professional training were supported by the military services would the recipients actually get any significant amount of military training? They would not, of course.

In case of compulsory military training, then, would we have *all* persons of certain age groups in the compulsory training program, thus hampering professional and vocational training, or, would we have a discriminative program in which some received very large portions of professional and vocational training, thus defeating the avowed purpose for which the military training is supposed to be demanded, while others, the politically underprivileged or the dullards, received "pure military training"?

#### SHOULD THE TRAINING BE COMPULSORY PHYSICAL TRAINING?

The alarmingly high proportion of rejections of persons from military service due to physical disability has led many to state that the compulsory training should be of a type calculated to build healthy young men and women of fine physical vigor. The former C.C.C. program is pointed to as an example of what direction this training could take. It is to be presumed that all the evils of the compulsory military program would be attendant on this program, including the breaking down of moral fiber and consequent damage to the home.

Further, what value would there be in compulsory physical training for the young prospective surgeon with the delicately skillful hands if in that training he were compelled to spend a year or so chopping logs, or cutting weeds, or building outhouses, or digging ditches, or building roads?

Is there anything useful in the way of physical training that the prospective physician or surgeon, or anyone else for that matter, would not get in his normal *educational* training? Could not any necessary extras—if there should be need for such—be provided in the regular educational program?

Further, is it not true that a proper program of physical training participated in by a large number of 20-year-olds would not insure them against being physical misfits at age of 25 or 26 or at any other age? So far as building physical fitness for our citizenry is concerned such a program should be started early in school life with a *continuous* emphasis upon developing health habits that will carry throughout life. A year of concentrated compulsory physical training would not be a proper program. It could only be a last resort and a very inadequate one at that.

Perhaps we should try to find from what economic and voca-

tional levels the greater proportion of "4 F's" have come. It would be interesting to note if the too great a proportion of "4 F's" would not now be with us *anyway* even if during these past many years we had been compelling young men and women to take a year's training of some sort. We suspect that the reason for the larger number of "4 F's" lies in their inadequate ability to buy medical service and proper food, and in their inadequate educational opportunity.

We must avoid (1) giving a training that becomes obsolete, (2) giving a training that directly or indirectly leads to moral laxity and social maladjustment, (3) giving a training that hampers development of the special talents of our young people, (4) giving a training that is discriminative and provides privilege for some and unfair restriction for others, (5) giving a training that makes all persons, regardless of talent or nature, fit into the same framework, (6) giving a training that after all would have little military or physical value beyond the year in which it actually was given, and (7) giving a training that not only would omit proper concern for the factors of moral, spiritual and home influence, failing as it would to carry on their beneficial and necessary processes, but would actually *neutralize* and *nullify* those factors so necessary to a democratic and religious nation.

We must avoid all the dangers referred to above, and in addition, all the dangers of standardization so deadly to democratic individuality and which is so characteristic of any kind of compulsory training, especially military training.

We are reminded of the story of Procrustes and his famous bed. All of his unfortunate captives were compelled to lie in this bed—if they were too long their extremities were cut off—if they were too short, they were stretched to the proper length! We must avoid any Procrustean processes in the training of the youth of a democracy!

#### WE MUST FORTIFY OUR FREEDOM WITH EXTENDED EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

In relation to conscripted enlistment for compulsory training of any sort in times of peace, we have omitted many items which might have been included. We have not mentioned, for instance, that for the nation's majority in a time of freedom from emer-



gency, to compel a minority who could not endorse a program to conform against its conscience in that program anyway, would be a most serious breach of the very foundations of democracy. Those things which would infringe upon personal liberty in an overt way and which to the minority would seem capricious, illogical and inadequate, must be avoided in a democracy. Two of the things that make democracies strong are the freedom guaranteed to minorities and the utilization of minority-opinion which often evidences the greater wisdom and insight.

Further, we must remind ourselves that in this country we spend many times as much for apprehending and incarcerating criminals as we do for educating the citizenry. In altogether too many cities the lowest ranking policeman makes a salary a third again what the *average* salary of the school teachers of that city amounts to!

If (1) we were to bring the expenditures for education up to a decent figure, if (2) we were to examine our educational offering and find wherein it needs to be improved, if (3) we were to see to it that our children and young people throughout the land, even those in the underprivileged marginal areas of the nation, were given a mandatory education up to eighteen years of age in *schools of first-rate standing*, regardless of location, if (4) we were to see that vocational and professional opportunities beyond high school were provided in educational institutions for all young people in their several respective frameworks of ability, would it not be true that we then should find no special values in insisting *also* that all young people be compelled to take a year's training in outdoor life, or in military training or in some other prescribed program of activities?

#### WE MUST FORTIFY OUR FREEDOM WITH IMPROVED SOCIAL CONDITIONS

Is it really so that those in our generation who again (for it is not a new idea) have conceived the idea of compulsory training "of some sort" have in mind a standing army of several hundred thousand ever changing 18-, 19-, 20- and 21-year-olds? Or is the proposal of compulsory training just another frantic effort at hiding the unemployment problem?

Would not the billions of dollars to be spent in a compulsory

training program be better spent in improving educational standards and spreading more equally the educational offering; in relieving the bad social conditions among the underprivileged people who are largely what they are because they have been denied educational participation of any suitable standard? We should not forget that our educational offering, lacking as it may be, has not prevented our having the best army and navy in the world. Would not the billions of dollars spent for military or some other kind of compulsory service to the government be better spent in helping young people learn how to make homes (something we have not learned to do very well yet), how to choose marital partners, how to prepare for useful vocational service, by all of these learning how to become first-rate citizens not only of this country, but of the world of nations?

Someone may ask, "But if we do not have a great standing army we shall lose all of the things which we hold dear in our democracy!" Not if we don't lie down on the job again like we did the last time shall we lose those things! If we do lie down on the job, depending upon a standing army held under the guise of introducing "some sort of compulsory training" will not insure our national well-being. We shall be just like the Frenchmen of 1939 back of their Maginot Line!

We hear it being urged on all sides that the program be adopted now while the people are *still in the mood*. We are being warned that we are in a new age, that the mechanism of warfare is now a fast changing quantity and will become increasingly so; we are being warned that geographical isolationism is no longer to be regarded as existent, that we are subject now to easy attack from distant points of the earth, that next time *we* shall be attacked *first*, and by surprise, and that unless we are ready we shall be annihilated!

We believe that the warnings are being given in good faith by those of the military whose main business is properly that of being pessimistic about the nation's safety in war.

We are of the mind, however, that if we have adequate intelligence services and adequately equipped and manned outposts (and none of these need be dependent upon a compulsory training program) we shall be quite as secure from attack as we can be. By far the greater problem of being prepared will be that of keeping equipped in up-to-the-minute fashion.

WE MUST FORTIFY OUR FREEDOM WITH INTERESTED  
PARTICIPATION IN WORLD-WIDE ACTIVITY

If we take an active, intelligent part in policing the world, if our equipment bespeaks our preparedness we then shall be throwing around enough international weight! We need not include a great standing army with several million reserves in order to convince the world we have become a warlike nation! This introduces a wholly new subject of international relationships which cannot be dealt with now. However, we hasten to say that we believe warlikeness represents a wholly wrong philosophy of national well-being. We are still old-fashioned enough to believe that "He who takes up the sword shall perish by the sword." The axis nations have attested to the truth of the statement!

We were not in this last war because we did not have compulsory military training from 1918 to 1940. We were in the war because of our indifference to world-wide responsibility, because of our eagerness to make money off the warring of other nations, and because of our complete negligence of the most obvious indications that Japan was "out to get us." The story that we had to placate Japan for a decade or so is a fine example of rationalization and after-thinking. The truth is, we were just too selfish and disinterested to pay attention to our responsibilities. We need not have been astonished that a warlike nation buying the greatest quantities of war materials from us was going to attack us! In fact now that we have learned some of the truth (some Americans knew more before the Congressional revelations than has yet been revealed) our biggest embarrassment lies in finding how many of our responsible officials were more chagrined than astonished on December 7, 1941. They need not have been surprised! A training program or a standing army can be nothing but ineffectual if the leadership is a bungling one.

If we keep alert and fill our responsibilities as a humanitarian nation we shall not be unexpectedly bombed from central Asia or Bulgaria!

Instead of a compulsory training program, let us have (1) a constructive educational program that would enable our citizens to become real citizens capable of meeting the humanitarian

needs of the times through a vocational, social, spiritual, physical and academic preparation for citizenship which will make us strong among nations. Instead of a compulsory training program, let us have (2) a program of world participation that would keep us *accurately* informed about world-happenings, that would encourage us to function properly in such a world-wide process and will insure us against any surprise—or emergency—war.

WE MUST FORTIFY OUR FREEDOM WITH INTERESTED  
SUPPORT OF SPIRITUAL VALUES

One of the important considerations of the home which is the basis of our democratic culture is the well-balanced education and training of its children toward the end that they may be enabled to successfully take their place in a society dedicated to the uplift of humanity and the service of God. Many parents are going to be deeply troubled at the prospect of their children growing up to take a place in a compulsory training program which morally and spiritually will be woefully inadequate, even seriously detrimental.

Many persons and thoughtful citizens of the United States are going to shudder at the prospect of the establishment of a controlled *youth movement* the history of which has already been indicated by European centers during the last 15 years.

The way to develop a citizenry that is physically strong, mentally alert, vocationally and academically prepared, spiritually and morally responsible has already been provided uniquely by the democracies of the world through their support of education.

The way to achieve these things has been provided uniquely by the United States of America through their *public school* system. If the benefits of that system have not reached as many as they should then the system should be *improved* and *extended* and more universally supported by the states in order that all might receive the unique benefit of a healthy democracy.

It is un-American to build a standing army for the purpose of providing employment or for the purpose of building a controlled youth movement. It is un-American to be so inefficient as to encourage a compulsory training that will compete with or tear down those things which could be achieved more completely and satisfactorily by our public and private school system. In

fact it cannot be shown that a year's compulsory training would do any better, than the public schools, the things that its proponents claim for it. This is so obvious that one doubts if what proponents of compulsory training claim as their purpose should be accepted as their real purpose.

In my view the proposal of some sort of continuous and compulsory year's training (which might become a compulsory two-or-three-year's service) is one of the gravest dangers that our country has encountered in its history! It is un-American to compel a people to change its whole way of life and forego its age-old liberties in order to engage in a program the values of which cannot be shown or demonstrated.

If we need a military organization to guard our shore line (which actually may be in far-off Asia) or to help to police the world let us find and furnish what is needed; let us enlist those who are capable of and are interested in the military and in international intelligence as careers and *pay them well for their service!* Let us not however have any compulsory training, military or otherwise, that might evolve into a compulsory youth movement governed by a centralized government! Let us continue to keep the administration of the military organization in the hands of the people who, after all, are the ones most concerned.

## PREJUDICE AND THE STUDY OF AMERICAN LITERATURE

JOHN C. HEPLER

INSTRUCTOR IN ENGLISH, DICKINSON COLLEGE

AS LONG ago as 1884, Charles William Eliot, president of Harvard University, claimed that the college curriculum was too narrow for a true liberal education.<sup>1</sup> He accused the colleges of not keeping pace with the intellectual development of the United States. If President Eliot were living today, doubtless he would not be shocked by the recent report which appeared in *The New York Times*.<sup>2</sup>

The burden of this report is that American literature in 1943-44 was taught to only 25,000 of the 600,000 day students in American colleges and universities. To put it another way, a little less than 6 per cent of the students in institutions of higher learning studied their national literature. Is it any wonder that college graduates, supposedly "educated," refer to Longfellow as Henry "Wordsworth" Longfellow, believe that Herman "Mellville," since he did not appear in the English literature course, must be Canadian, and think that Hart Crane and Stephen Crane were brothers? That such statements are not exaggerations can be proved simply by asking college seniors a series of elementary questions based on their country's literature.

The unfortunate truth is that the rank and file of American college and university students fail to learn even the basic facts of American literature, and the English major seldom, if ever, gets more than a liberal dose of Emerson, Hawthorne and Whitman, generally conceded to be the greatest American writers. Why is it that in a nation willing to fight to keep its heritage free, many colleges and universities do not feel that the makers of that heritage and the heritage itself are worth studying?

The first answer is that American literature is a relatively young college study when compared with Greek, Latin and other

<sup>1</sup> Charles William Eliot, "What Is a Liberal Education?" *Century*, XXVIII, June, 1884, 212.

<sup>2</sup> Benjamin Fine, "Education in Review," *The New York Times*, XCV, December 9, 1945, E9.



traditional subjects. At the turn of the century, only a handful of colleges offered the subject, and as late as the teens of the twentieth century, only one course in American literature, Mr. Bernard De Voto recalls, was taught at Harvard University.<sup>3</sup> More importantly, only a small handful of influential professors in the several key institutions were willing to teach the subject and considered it one worthy of scholarly attention.

In short, in most colleges American literature was not "respectable," and was for years "neglected, scorned, or ignored by curriculum makers."<sup>4</sup> Unfortunately, in a great number of colleges and universities, even today, American literature has the same status: the baby—and unwanted, at that—of the English curriculum. The inability of schools of higher learning to offer suitable and adequate offerings in American literature is at least one instance of the so-called "inflexible" curriculum of higher education.

A second answer is the deep-seated prejudice of the English professors themselves who look upon American literature as "the stepchild of the English department."<sup>5</sup> Professor Charlton G. Laird several years ago wrote a paper which was entitled "The Importance of Being a Literary Orphan."<sup>6</sup> While his reflections revealed certain positive values in being an "orphan," there is no mistaking the fact that his remarks formed a distinctively minority opinion. American literature has been, and still is, in the very heavy shadow cast by English literature, which remains today the point of departure for the studies of most English students and scholars in the United States of America.

Most undergraduate students take the English literature survey and perhaps courses in Shakespeare, Chaucer and the Victorian poets. English majors concentrate on the latter three and study also Anglo-Saxon, Middle English, the English lyric,

<sup>3</sup> Bernard De Voto, "The Maturity of American Literature," *Saturday Review of Literature*, XXVII, August 5, 1944, 14-18. Mr. De Voto's article reveals clearly the unenviable position of American literature in such places as Yale, Harvard and Princeton.

<sup>4</sup> John T. Flanagan, "American Literature in American Colleges," *College English*, I, March, 1940, 513.

<sup>5</sup> William D. Loy, "American Literature in the College of Tomorrow," *Journal of Higher Education*, XV, February, 1944, 100.

<sup>6</sup> *College English*, V, December, 1943, 129-136.

Milton, the Neo-Classic Age, the Romantic Period, including Wordsworth, Shelley, Byron, Keats, and others, and other specialized courses. In the majority of colleges and universities, American literature for the undergraduate means a survey course, and to English majors, the survey and a course in the Romantic Period in America. It is clear that English literature remains the aristocrat of the English department in both graduate and undergraduate schools throughout the nation.

The professors who do the teaching and who comprise, for the most part, the scholars, year after year focus attention on British literature or on literature of other foreign countries. Professor Howard Mumford Jones, for example, in analyzing the contents of *PMLA* from 1884 to 1934 counted 1,405 articles and papers devoted to linguistic and literary studies. Of these papers, a mere forty-five had as their subject American letters in general, and only twenty-nine of the forty-five dealt directly with American literature!<sup>7</sup> In other words, scholars in the field of literature showed a greater concern with problems related to general linguistics, comparative literature and British literature than to American authors and literary problems. Furthermore, Professor Jones pointed out, "The large majority of our professors of English have only a superficial acquaintance with American literature, . . . . Many of the learned display an affable condescension to the field."<sup>8</sup> The study of English literature in our colleges is simply the study of British literature.

The defense of those who look askance at American letters is that British literature is as much a part of the American inheritance as of the British inheritance; that the United States came late to its maturity and has not developed a Shakespeare, a Milton, or a Wordsworth; and that the variety of themes treated in American literature is meager compared to the variety expressed in English literature, which is longer in point of years and richer than our native expression.<sup>9</sup>

These expressions certainly are commendable, but they do not build up an impregnable case against American literature. To

<sup>7</sup> "American Scholarship and American Literature," *American Literature*, I, May, 1936, 123.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 118-119.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 120.

be sure British thought is important, but what happened to British thought when it came, by way of human beings who are peculiarly subject to change according to influences of environment, to the shores of North America? Are not these influences and changes worthy of study?

If we look in vain to American literature for a Shakespeare, a Milton, or a Wordsworth, it is equally fruitless to look to German, Italian, French or Russian literature for these men. The point, of course, is that American literature is supposed not to have any writer of equal capabilities. Anyone would admit to the peerless quality of Shakespeare, and no one would question the greatness of either Milton or Wordsworth. But to name only the "best" in British literature as justification for studying that subject and to say, "See, no American writers are comparable to these," is hardly a defense for ignoring our national literature. We have our "greats" too in Whitman, Hawthorne, Emily Dickinson, Emerson and others, and like British literature we have our minor figures. For Americans to specialize in these British writers to the exclusion of our own literature is as bad as English department members who deliberately choose to teach the "advanced courses" to the exclusion of freshman composition, which is considered too much drudgery by many professors.

The variety of themes in American literature is less than in English literature. At the same time, however, adequate and complete studies remain to be done in the field of colonial American literature, for example, and Professor Jones pointed out in 1936 the need for a competent history of American literature. Cooper, Hawthorne and Poe, among the writers of the so-called "Golden Age," could stand more of the scholars' attention, and there is certainly a need for studies of such men as Twain, Moody, Robinson, and others who fall in the period between 1865 and the present.\*

The prejudice of the professors leads conclusively to the third answer to the question of why no American literature. The col-

\* The prejudice among the professors of English literature concerning American literature is also shared by many Americans. A few evenings ago I heard a wife of a professor assert with finality that Poe wrote *all* his poems and stories while he was intoxicated; and a few moments later she condemned Whitman for immorality and in practically the same breath said she had been enjoying Oscar Wilde's writings!

leges and universities do not give adequate training to the students who will become teachers. Decade after decade, the emphasis is on British literature. Graduates take from the universities and colleges not only the information of their professors relative to British writings, but also the professors' deeply-ingrained prejudices against American literature. Hence, our own literature has had an almost impossible barrier to cross in its quest of attaining to the sacred status of a truly academic study.

And but for a few "specialists" who manage to secure eminence in the study of our national literature *despite*, not because of, their university training, American literature as a study in institutions of learning would not have enroled even the six per cent reported in the *Times*.

Even among the "specialists" in American literature, however, there is a definite tendency to minimize certain periods and concentrate on others. In some cases the period from 1809 to 1865 is the focal point. Colonial literature is omitted, and modern literature is deliberately ignored. One university professor who begins his course with Irving and comes down to contemporary literature said, "Oh, but there isn't much before Irving, really!" Other specialists begin at the turn of the twentieth century, neglecting what has gone before. This specialization may be suitable for advanced students, but too often an elementary survey course, which should attempt at least to present a complete, continuous history of literature, becomes "a thinly disguised pretext for an examination of the 'golden period' of the nineteenth century,"<sup>10</sup> or any other period or specialty the professor desires to have his students study.

It is true that the names of Emerson, Hawthorne, Cooper and others of the golden period are often considered the "heart" of American literature, but for emphasis to be placed on these writers alone is as stupid as studying only Elizabethan literature without consideration of the other periods of English literature. To be sure colonial writings may be characterized by their mediocrity as literature; but mediocre or not, they are as much a part of the American heritage as Lowell or Holmes.

With such training, is it any wonder that our critics, or at least

<sup>10</sup> Norman Holmes Pearson, "Surveying American Literature," *College English*, I, April, 1940, 583.

the few who successfully refrain from becoming "judge" for the various commercial book companies, look with askance at our literature, both past and present? The custom seems to be to praise the French or the English or the Russian author, and to belittle the American. This is not a plea for critics to cover their minds with a soaked chamois and, willy-nilly, heap encomiums upon all American books or literary products. What is needed is an admission that it is possible that a great American novelist or poet may appear or already may have appeared; what is needed is a willingness to seek for values and not simply heap scorn. If our critics were more concerned with the business of truly identifying books instead of with following the fashion of being "pseudo-hardboiled,"<sup>11</sup> they could do much to foster interest in and spirit about our national literature, past, present and future.

Dr. William G. Crane, Chairman of the English department, City College, is reported in *The New York Times* as saying, "The Committee does not advocate American literature at the expense of the study of English literature."<sup>12</sup> British literature is superior to American in many ways, but if the necessity arose of choosing only one of the two for American college students, I unhesitatingly would say, "Let's study our own." It is our literature and our heritage. How much longer are American scholars to know all other literatures except their own? How much longer must our inferiority complex keep us blind to the true worth, even if it be less from a literary standpoint than that of England, of our native writing?

Were American literature as poor and thin as specialists in other fields profess to consider it, it would still be true that a knowledge of the national literature is as necessary a part of the equipment of the American scholar as a knowledge of his national literature is a necessary part of the equipment of the French or German or British or Italian or Spanish scholar. It is only in the United States that professors of literature are permitted to be scandalously ignorant of their own national achievement.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>11</sup> George Jean Nathan, "The Theatre," Sub-titled, "Clinical Dramatic Notes," *American Mercury*, LXII, January, 1946, 48.

<sup>12</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. E9.

<sup>13</sup> Jones, *op. cit.*, p. 120.

Fortunately, colleges and universities are not faced with the dilemma of one or the other. American literature asks only the privilege of a voice from the mouths of trained men interested in the subject and able to study it with as much diligence and leisure as the English scholars have studied British literature. Under such conditions, the study of American literature will not be shadowed by British; American students will come to know and take pride in their national literature; and the subject in time will take its rightful and respectable place in the curriculum along with the literatures of the other great nations of the world.



## BENEFIT PLANS FOR NON-ACADEMIC EMPLOYEES

RAINARD B. ROBBINS

VICE-PRESIDENT, TEACHERS INSURANCE AND ANNUITY ASSOCIATION

**C**OLLEGES were among the leaders in planning for the retirement of professional workers. When industry had scarcely begun to think about planning how to part with older workers and long before national planning for retirement income was even considered, a number of colleges had well-developed plans for retirement of their faculty members, following principles that are still among the most progressive. But these institutions usually gave little attention to similar planning with respect to non-academic employees.

In recent years educational institutions have come to realize, as never before, that they are employers; that they have the same responsibilities as other employers with respect to their employees; that among the most serious situations confronting their workers and their families is the destruction of earned income through the ravages of death or old age; and therefore that to be a "good" employer, the institution must plan for at least modest replacement of earned income when this is gone.

This consciousness of responsibility on the part of institutional officers has come about through the growth of the institutions, through completion of urbanization of life for the workers and their families, and, perhaps most of all, through the competitive position developed by the benefits made available under our social security legislation to industrial workers and their families.

Paragraphs that follow undertake to analyze a problem faced by officers of many educational institutions today, particularly colleges and universities—how to plan with respect to non-academic employees for retirement and retirement income.

### THE NEED FOR PLANNING

For professional workers, the gradual accumulation of vested retirement equities is recognized as valuable, if not essential, to attract the best talent, to hold the best talent, to facilitate parting with those who cease to fit into the organization, whatever the cause, and to provide retirement income. Another value might

well be added—to keep and to foster the good name of the institution among alumni and the general public.

When we turn to plans for non-academic employees, wide variation may be expected in the appraisal of these different expectations from benefit plans, and a discussion of the application of each may help us toward conclusions as to desirable types of benefits and methods of administration.

*Employment Value*—Employment for educational institutions is excepted from the coverage of the Social Security Act. If I paint a factory building, this law requires that my employer and I contribute toward provision of an old age benefit for my wife and myself, and a benefit for my widow and children in case of my untimely death. I might look forward to an old age annuity of something like \$50 a month; and if, through my earlier death, I should leave a widow and a young child or children, they might expect \$60 or more a month until the children reach age 18. But, if I paint a college building or a school house other than as an employee of a contractor in business for profit, no such contributions or prospects of benefits are in the picture. Hence when I come to paint for the college the foreman to whom I hand my social security card regrets to tell me that this card has no meaning so far as work for the college is concerned.

College officers are just beginning to realize that a moral responsibility is here involved. As a rule, neither the worker nor the foreman has any idea of the magnitude of the possible benefits that will be sacrificed by such a change in employment. It is the business of the college officers to know the law. Certainly among the purposes of the college are dissemination of knowledge and raising of living standards; the college must be sympathetic to the underprivileged and to the ignorant. It can hardly practice "the employee beware" as its rule in dealing with its workers; certainly, if it should, it could expect no high degree of loyalty. It is therefore most seriously suggested that when a college hires a man with a family, especially for non-academic work, it should see to it that the man understands clearly the possible loss involved for himself and his family, and what, if anything, is offered in substitution for the exclusion from social security coverage.

Very gradually during the past nine years the unfavorable

competitive employment position of educational institutions in this respect has come to be recognized. Gradually, individuals have come to realize the value of their social security cards and, of course, the extreme shortage of labor in recent years has led prospective employees to be more discriminating in their choice of jobs. Hence the first value of the benefit arrangements here discussed—their value in attracting desirable employees—is becoming keenly felt with respect to non-academic workers.

Benefit plans are probably as valuable in holding good employees as in attracting them. Certainly the expectations of retirement benefits and of benefits in case of untimely death are becoming sufficiently general today that the employer who cannot offer them is in a poor competitive position compared with one who can.

The value of vested retirement expectations to ease the parting with any who withdraw either voluntarily or otherwise is coming to be recognized more and more. The retirement expectations of a worker in industry are not affected by any change in employment within the classes to which the Social Security Act applies, and an educational institution will be open to criticism if it represents that a plan it has devised substitutes for social security benefits unless retirement expectations under it survive changes in employment.

*Public Relations Value*—The value of planning for retirement income to smooth the parting with superannuated employees needs no comment, whether we are thinking of professional or other workers. A word is in order, however, regarding the goodwill value to the institution, particularly when dealings with non-academic employees are involved. The general public is more aware than ever before of the responsibility of employers toward their employees. Hence good employment relations are today essential for continued public goodwill toward any employing organization.

Not so long ago the thought was prevalent that those who worked for educational, philanthropic and charitable institutions should not be self-seeking; they should make their personal sacrifices for the high objectives of their organization. A gradual change is taking place in this point of view, brought about by at least two basic tendencies. In the first place, many of these insti-

tutions are becoming quite substantial employers, each employee representing a family in the community, and the dependence of the family on earned income is becoming more and more nearly complete. In the second place, it is getting more and more difficult to allocate "good works," whether religious, educational, philanthropic or charitable to any particular set of institutions or industries. The field of the school, the pulpit and the lecture platform is invaded by the printing press, the radio, phonograph records and the movies.

These changes have contributed to the leveling of different employments with respect to responsibility of employers toward their employees. In our growing suburban communities the employment connections of the breadwinners come to have less and less significance. Family wants and needs and associations with neighboring families come to be largely independent of the nature of employment. Hence an institution endangers public goodwill if it claims exemption from regulations devised to assure better employment conditions.

Unfortunately, employment for educational institutions whether publicly or privately administered, is excepted from application of the Social Security Act. There is no immediate prospect of a change, and, with respect to employment for publicly administered institutions, it seems likely that the exception may continue for a long time; hence the interest at various institutions in exploring substitute arrangements.

#### FACTORS AFFECTING SOLUTION

At first thought it seems reasonable that whatever plan is appropriate to provide retirement and survivors' benefits for professional workers can be extended to advantage to apply to other employees. Why not? The family problems in case of untimely death of the worker are much the same; the need for income in old age is largely independent of occupation during working years. If there are important differences that dictate a variation in method, they lie not in the needs of the worker and his family, but rather in the nature of employment relations.

As compared with professional workers, non-academic workers are generally on a lower salary level and may be less apt to continue with the same employer for long periods of years. They

attain maximum skill after relatively short periods of service so that their wages vary far less with age and period of service than do the salaries of professional workers. Their work requires far less preparation so that they can change employers and, after a few days or weeks in the new job, work with very much the same efficiency that they have shown in the old one. They are usually occupied with their jobs only during working hours. While their loyalty may be just as genuine as that of professional workers, they are less frequently called upon to weigh problems of institutional or departmental policy.

When the efficiency of a non-academic worker decreases because of age, often no great harm will result except that additional help will be needed. This is by no means always the case, and many administrators are convinced that no economy is involved in continuing any employees in service after their powers begin to wane. With professional workers, much more than dollar value is involved if superannuated persons are continued in service. The morale of the whole professional group may be lowered and the training of students—the purpose of an educational institution—may suffer in ways that cannot be corrected with respect to the particular students concerned.

*Size of Institution*—A factor that should not be neglected in considering whether different mechanisms should be used in benefit plans for professional and other workers is the size of the institution. Many of our most valuable colleges have relatively small faculties with correspondingly small numbers of non-academic employees. If such a college is in a small town, the intimacy of contact between professional and other workers is such that this alone may determine there shall be no distinction between classes so far as benefit plans are concerned. Even if a small college is in a large city, it is apt to be fairly compact physically as a matter of economy if nothing else, and the intimacy of associations may be almost as close as if the college were more isolated.

It would seem wise under such circumstances to use very much the same kind of arrangement for all. Whether or not contributions are the same size and distributed in the same way between employer and employee is relatively unimportant; but the rights and expectations of individuals of different classes had better



be of very much the same types. When we turn to large institutions we find some of them in large cities and some in communities that they dominate. It seems, however, that the size of the institution is more important than the size of the community so far as our present problem is concerned. Faculty members of large institutions are rarely closely grouped around a campus nowadays. If in large cities, public conveyances permit them to spread in all directions; if in small towns, automobiles have led to their dispersion to considerable areas where they can live semi-rural lives. While non-academic employees scatter in the same manner, they probably live within a smaller radius of the campus because of longer work hours on the campus and the cost of transportation.

Thus we can expect that in a large institution not even the professional employees are closely knit, and intimacy of contact with other employees is only sporadic.

*Public vs. Private Institutions*—Certainly the method of administration of the institution has nothing whatever to do with the need of benefits. But non-academic workers of a number of publicly administered institutions are covered by retirement plans devised for all public employees of the state or municipality, often with professional workers of educational institutions excepted. When such a plan is in effect, nothing further is usually advisable despite the fact that practically all these public plans contain certain elements of weakness that have characterized them from the time the first contributory plans of this type were established prior to 1920.

Where such plans are not in effect, state institutions have the same kind of problems before them as do private institutions, with the exception that the problems are intensified by the fact that apparently there is little prospect that public employment will be covered by social security for years to come.

#### SUGGESTIONS FOR NON-ACADEMIC EMPLOYEE BENEFIT PLANS

With preceding paragraphs as a background, we now face the question: should colleges and universities adopt for non-academic employees benefit plans that are substantially different from those for professional workers, or should they merely extend their



present faculty plans to all employees? With respect to plans for retirement income, interest centers about retirement age, benefits at retirement, and, if the plan is to be funded, the relative size of contributions of employer and employee and provisions for settlement in case of withdrawal from service. Present plans for survivors' benefits are so far from uniform that they offer little guidance as to extensions. At a particular institution plans for retirement income and for survivors' benefits should certainly be related. It therefore seems advisable to center attention on a plan for retirement benefits and then adjust survivors' benefits to this plan.

*Retirement Age*—Most college plans today require retirement at age 65, unless, by special action of the governing body in individual cases, service is continued beyond this age. As a rule, permissive retirement has little meaning because the retirement benefit is provided by a retirement annuity contract owned by the participant, under which annuity payments may be started at the will of the participant. Under such circumstances the participant may make his retirement age as low as he pleases. Whether permission to retire will be appropriate in a plan for non-academic employees will depend upon the nature of the benefits. A normal retirement age lower than 65 years is sometimes desired, especially if large numbers of women workers are employed. But as yet there is no evidence of widespread interest among the colleges in lowering the retirement age below 65 years.

*Benefits at Retirement*—As a rule, college retirement plans fix contributions to purchase retirement annuity contracts and let the benefits be whatever they will. Of course, the contribution rates are determined with an eye to the general level of benefits desired but, with the sources of college income what they are and with interest earnings and longevity so uncertain, it has seemed unwise to encourage colleges to make long-term promises as to the size of benefits. Hence the widespread practice of colleges in helping to pay contributions to purchase annuity contracts owned by participating employees, as their method of avoiding unknowable outlays that would otherwise be involved in parting with superannuated workers.

*Contributions*—The usual practice is, equal sharing of contri-

butions between the college and the participant; but conditions at particular institutions, or strongly held convictions on the part of college officers or trustees, have resulted in several variations from this method. There is, however, widespread appreciation of the sense of cooperation that is fostered by joint contributions to attain an end desired and appreciated by all concerned.

*Withdrawal Settlement*—This is the tail that wags the dog. Strange as it may seem, the decision on this point—often resting on the handling of administrative details—effectively colors the whole plan. What is socially constructive on this point seems clear and has been accepted in plans for professional workers at nearly all colleges and universities that have established separate contributory retirement plans. These plans are joint contributory undertakings to accumulate gradually during working years substantial sums dedicated to a specific purpose for particular individuals—the provision of income when earnings cease through retirement. From the standpoint of the worker, they rest on the obvious fact that need in retirement will be independent of how frequently the worker may change employers or kinds of employment, and on the statistical observation that few individuals succeed in preparing for retirement income, voluntarily through their own individual efforts.

The college, on its part, recognizes the value of the interchange of professional talent among educational institutions. It has come to realize that it must encourage this gradual building of retirement equities if it is to attract and hold desirable staff members and that, to attain its objectives of social betterment, it cannot be a party to a plan for retirement income that ignores those who withdraw from its employ before retirement. Yet many colleges and universities that have accepted these principles with respect to faculty members have simply failed to plan for retirement of other workers. In fact, the operation in industry of the old age and survivors' insurance provision of the Social Security Act has brought some college officers to realize with something of a shock that, while they had been highly idealistic in their planning for professional workers, they had scarcely been conscious of the problems faced by their other employees—a group often less able to fend for themselves.

But when we plan for retirement of non-academic workers we

meet practical problems that challenge adherence to our social objectives. These center about high turnover in employment of this type and lack of appreciation on the part of the employees themselves of the precautions that need to be taken if our objectives are to be approached. The principle is clear that if increments of prospective retirement benefits are accumulated over all periods of employment, the sum total of these increments will be substantial for those who retire after a reasonable total period of service, all employments counted. But if Smith works at Sweetwater College for six months at age 30 and then goes elsewhere, there are practical difficulties in having a corresponding retirement equity available to him some 35 years later. Our social security plan meets these difficulties and there is now pretty general agreement that this mechanism should cover college employment; but, since it does not do so, the colleges must, at least for the present, find another solution.

Again, even if the college lays plans to provide this retirement equity in a continuing fashion for Smith, it can rest assured that Smith will not be appreciative and will ask that he be repaid in cash whatever he contributed. A little consideration of these difficulties leads usually to the conclusion that there is no wholly satisfactory solution. Whatever scheme is adopted will be only partially successful; hence we must expect a lack of uniformity in the decisions at different institutions. It is with this in mind that the suggestions given below are offered for whatever merit different readers may ascribe to them.

*At Small Institutions*—It is probably unwise at a small institution to adopt benefit provisions for non-academic employees that differ in kind from those for professional workers. Normal retirement age may well be the same for both; the number reaching this age in a single year will be small and possible extensions of service may very well be considered in each case on its merits, regardless of type of employment. It is well to have the same choice of retirement settlements for all so that all may feel they are treated alike. Also, it is good policy to have like treatment in case of withdrawal from service. If a professional worker carries with him upon withdrawal the equity established by employer contributions as well as his own, while a janitor receives only the accumulation of his own contributions, the college lays

itself open to the criticism of having been less considerate of the underprivileged worker. If a non-academic worker receives a cash settlement upon withdrawal, a withdrawing professional worker is bound to consider himself abused if his request for cash is refused. Thus, especially when numbers are small and staff members are closely associated, only discord can be expected if settlement provisions vary with different classes of workers.

When we consider contribution rates, if the institution must apologize for its wage scale it can well afford to have the non-academic employees contribute a smaller proportion of the total cost than is required of professional workers. If the wage scale is entirely defensible, this suggestion usually has little merit.

There is some defense for making the total of contributions a smaller percentage of compensation for non-academic employees than for professional workers because for them contributions of a particular percentage of wages will give a benefit more satisfactorily related to final salary than for professional workers. It is important to bear in mind, however, that retirement benefits need to be a higher percentage of final pay for low wage employees than for professional workers.

*At Larger Institutions*—When we come to large institutions a variety of situations justify consideration. The kinds of needs of individuals and their families are much the same as at smaller institutions and much the same for workers of all classes. The sense of responsibility on the part of college officers may be different—partly because associations among workers of different groups, or even of the same group, are less intimate and partly because a possibly less cooperative attitude on the part of employees may destroy the normally sympathetic interest of college officers.

In some of the larger institutions, non-academic employees place their trust and their loyalty in their own union organizations; when this occurs they are apt to emphasize higher cash wages and place less dependence on plans for old age and survivors' insurance. Loyalty of employees is not only of great value to the institution, but of inestimable psychological value to the workers themselves. Certainly any worker is more valuable, more contented, and much happier if he feels, not only that his efforts are essential and are appreciated, but that the institu-

tion is, in a sense, his own; that he has a responsibility for its success and therefore an urge to make his efforts purposeful and constructive.

Normally the officers of the institution are interested in planning now to ease the parting with workers and their families when earned income ceases; but if contentious striving for advantage on the part of both institutional and employee representatives develops a cold and ruthless attitude and a tendency for each to demand the "pound of flesh" in its bargaining, the danger is that the institutional officers may be discouraged in their planning to the extent that they will be poorly prepared to care for retirements as they occur, and no recognition will be given to a worker who withdraws from service before retirement, regardless of the circumstances of the parting. This would reflect against the good name of the institution in these days of popular emphasis on planning for old age and survivors' benefits.

Let us assume then that large institutions, like small ones, recognize the necessity of providing retirement benefits for non-academic employees, at least so long as the present exemption from social security coverage continues. How best can this be arranged and how shall the plan differ from that for professional workers? As to retirement age, all that need be added to what has already been written is that numbers may be large enough to justify a lower retirement age for some groups if this seems desirable; as a rule, however, there is no clearcut conviction that this is best.

*Pension Promises Only*—The high turnover among non-academic employees and their frequent lack of enthusiasm for small pension equities leads some to favor no formality other than the promise of pensions calculated in a specified way to those who complete a stated period of service and attain a stated age. This is an easy way out of many difficulties since it requires no contributions from employees and the exercise of no choice on their part. Since it has the appearance of a gift from the employer, it is apt to arouse no opposition when announced. There are no troublesome administrative details; all that is necessary is a good record of years of service and whatever wage records may be necessary to determine the benefit. In case of death or withdrawal from service, voluntary or otherwise, no benefit is in-



volved. Of course, such a plan can be accompanied by a corresponding benefit in case of death in service.

But the shortcomings of plans of this type have led to their abandonment, not only for professional workers in educational institutions, but also for the rank and file of industrial workers. These shortcomings center largely about the absence of a withdrawal benefit. Several transfers from one employer to another during a normal working lifetime are the rule rather than the exception in this country, especially among non-professional employees. There is no evidence that this experience will change rapidly in the future. Hence the adoption of such a plan is an admission of a non-social, if not an anti-social, point of view in that it is well recognized all the time that the plan will have no meaning for most employees and that, if short service employees spend the other segments of their working years with employers having plans of the same kind, they will reach retirement age with little in the way of income expectations.

Now that industrial employers and employees are required to participate in a retirement plan in which shifts in employment have no effect on pension expectations, a college or university would be particularly open to criticism if it should adopt a scheme, such as here described, as a substitute for social security coverage. The criticism would probably not come when the plan was established, but rather after a number of object lessons appeared in the form of loss of employment on the part of individuals in middle age with substantial periods of service behind them. If such a plan were in effect for non-academic employees the contrast would be striking between the treatment of a withdrawing non-academic employee and a withdrawing professional employee, perhaps both in the same family. Perhaps there is sufficient understanding of the weaknesses of such an arrangement that they need not be labored further.

*Contributory Plan with Cash Withdrawal*—The next proposal is apt to be a joint contributory plan of the type so common in industry, upon withdrawal from which the participant receives in cash his own contributions, with or without interest. When there is no more favorable plan for ready comparison, a plan of this type is usually acceptable to employees. It seems reasonable to a short-service employee that, if he quits, he should expect no



more than his own contribution with interest; he has not retired and therefore the employer should not be burdened with a retirement benefit for him. Furthermore, the psychology of receiving his "savings" makes for contentment; we all like to get our fingers on cash, and repayment of his contributions gives the individual a sense of satisfaction that he has saved so much. Only those fairly well along in years will realize the loss of pension expectations and many of them will avoid this loss, if possible, by hanging on to their jobs. Those whose jobs "play out" when they are well along in years are hurt worst; not only have they lost their chance at retirement benefit—they have little chance of another job.

A modification of this plan that has gained popularity in recent years is designed to correct the weaknesses here mentioned with respect to those who withdraw from service. For those who withdraw after a substantial period of participation in the plan, usually not less than ten years, it would offer a choice between the return of employer contributions or the expectation of the retirement benefit purchased by contributions of both employer and employee.

Certainly this removes the objection that withdrawal necessarily means destruction of retirement equities *for those who meet the minimum service requirement*, but as a practical matter it is probably of importance only to those who withdraw at relatively high ages after substantial periods of service. Most retirement plans of this type today require from participants the same contribution as a percentage of salary at all ages and promise an annuity increment of a fixed percentage of salary for each year of service. Under such a scheme the employer's contribution is relatively small at early ages and very heavy at advanced ages. For this reason, the employer's contribution, even if fully vested, is relatively small for those who withdraw from service at fairly early ages. However, this is not the reason why most withdrawing individuals will choose to take cash even if a prospective retirement benefit is offered; the value of the retirement equity is probably rarely fully appreciated. When cash is available and separation is apparently complete, and especially if the withdrawal means a period of unemployment, cash looks unduly attractive to nearly everyone.

Even among professional workers, if prospective retirement benefits are to be widely preserved, cash offers must not be available during working years. With the vicissitudes of life what they are, few of us will resist over a period of thirty or forty years the temptation to take cash when this is available, even if substantial loss of equity is involved.

It should also be borne in mind that the college is more than an employer. It is a leader in the solution of social problems. A plan of this type is little better than a mere pension promise if our objective is to see that those who retire after long periods of total service for all employers shall look forward to substantial retirement income. Under either of these schemes no employer will welcome a new employee of advanced age, and only the more daring and more energetic employee of middle age or higher will change employments if he can help it. An institution of higher education must ask itself seriously if the operation of such a plan is compatible with its ideals and objectives. The simple fact is that retirement plans of this type cannot meet our social need of retirement income for substantially all workers; if only plans of this type existed, large numbers would receive meager retirement benefits and many workers past middle age would have difficulty finding work; yet breaks in employment would continue from the large variety of causes that now bring them about.

A college that contributes toward the purchase of retirement annuity contracts for professional employees, these contracts being owned by the employees, should be cautious about adopting for non-academic workers a plan such as just described. The salary of a young instructor may be the same as that of a head-groundsman; they might be in the same family; both may withdraw at the same time. The instructor would retain the equity established by college contributions; the groundsman would settle for just half this value in cash. This would merely emphasize the contrast that would doubtless be well recognized by the officers recommending the plan.

*Extension of Faculty Plan*—Last to mention, is the procedure that is first thought of—extend participation in the professional workers plan. The other suggestions come to mind because of difficulties and costs known to be involved in this extension. Those who deal with non-academic employees in a large institu-

tion know full well that only a small proportion of them will stay until retirement; almost instinctively they seek to save for the college the cost of contributions on its part that withdrawing workers might carry away with them. Besides, there is the nuisance and futility that is so obvious with respect to those who stay only a short time.

The faculty plan may require participation after two years' service and this may seem desirable. Should this be applied to the 21-year-old stenographer who has been with the college two years and who is already wearing an engagement ring? This is only one of a large variety of difficulties that lead the practical mind to seek a compromise with well-recognized ideals that the college should maintain.

Earlier paragraphs furnish two good reasons for considering the possible extension of the faculty plan: (1) no satisfactory substitute has been found; and (2) the possible embarrassment from operating two widely different plans with different objectives, and thus involving conflicting "deals" with different sets of employees having in general different compensation levels—all the time having in mind that the kinds of family needs to be met are very much the same for all.

There is reason to believe that little imagination has been exercised in seeking modifications of retirement plans for professional workers that might make them practicable for non-academic employees. Certainly there should be nothing surprising about this when we consider that administrative officers of most colleges and universities have not specialized in this field, and especially that they are continually burdened with such a variety of urgent problems entirely foreign to these considerations. The fact is that several good-sized institutions—not among our largest—are leading the way in this development and seem to be successful in operating single or closely analogous plans for both classes of employees. Here are some suggestions:

1. Establish employment procedures so as to use great care in engaging the services of individuals; this is only fair to prospective employees and well worth-while to the institution.
2. Classify employees carefully with particular attention to a temporary or probationary class. Establish a procedure that will fix responsibility when an individual is transferred out of the temporary or probationary class.

3. Limit the retirement plan to those who have passed beyond the probationary class and have been in service for a stated period which may be relatively short—from six months to two years.

4. Permit participation of only full-time "regular" employees and define "regular" to fit conditions at your institution.

5. Require participation of eligibles—those who may participate—when they have passed some stated age, like 30 years, and have completed a stated period of service which may be from six months to three or four years.

This period could be scaled thus:

4	years	and	attainment	of	age	34,
3	"	"	"	"	"	35,
2	"	"	"	"	"	36, or
1	year	"	"	"	"	37, or more.

6. Exclude from the regular plan unusual classes of employees who are employed only at advanced ages, like 50 or 55 years, but consider carefully the responsibility the institution will have for these individuals when service will normally be discontinued.

7. Consider the advisability of (a) a different level of contributions for non-academic employees, and (b) a different division of contributions between employer and employee.

Aside from increased care in initial employment and classification of employees, perhaps the most important of these suggestions is that participation be available on rather liberal conditions, but required only after attaining some age, like 30 years. This will make the plan available to the few in their 20's who are particularly interested but will avoid a great deal of the nuisance element arising from a high turnover of employees. With respect to those hired at older ages, much of this nuisance can be avoided by careful selection and classification of employees, but the waiting period should not be lengthened for those past 30 with this in mind, because further delay in starting annuity accumulations will make contributions too large or benefits too small.

Any of these suggestions can be incorporated in a plan for professional workers without serious harm, and often to distinct advantage. Careful attention to them is urged before deciding on a radically different scheme for non-academic workers. It is all too easy to formulate a plan for these employees that will come to reflect no credit on the institution and lead to unpleasant comparisons with the faculty plan.

It may be well to add that if radically different plans are decided upon for faculty and non-academic employees, it will probably be best to employ different administrative agencies.

*Past Service Benefits*—Whether an entirely separate plan is established for non-academic employees or a plan already operating is extended to cover them, special attention may need to be given to those well along in years when the plan begins. If an entirely separate plan is established, this would normally be a feature to receive particular attention. If a plan already operating is extended to non-academic employees, a special provision will usually need to be added for this purpose if the staff is large.

Perhaps the most common method is for the employer to hold out an expectation or make a definite promise of a pension to a retiring participant of 1% (or a somewhat smaller or larger fraction) of present salary multiplied by the number of years of service after attaining age 30 and up to the time the plan starts. The past service benefit should be so calculated as to be reasonably related to the benefits anticipated with respect to current service. This general idea is used in retirement plans that vary widely in their provisions with respect to future service.

#### ATTITUDE OF TIAA TOWARD NON-ACADEMIC EMPLOYEES

As its name implies, TIAA was originally organized to serve particularly the teaching group. It recognizes that benefits such as it offers are needed by other employees of cooperating institutions, that it is advantageous for these institutions to go to a single company in arranging benefits for all kinds of employees, and that any effort on its part to limit the classes of employees with which it will deal will introduce administrative difficulties, even if the discrimination is clearly defensible. Hence the Association offers its contracts alike to all employees of any institution of the classes to which it limits its attention.

For the funding of retirement plans the Association has devised a retirement annuity contract in accordance with what it considers fundamental principles, and these principles seem to be independent of the kind of service different employees perform. After repeated discussions, it has found no justification for offering different kinds of contracts for different institutions or for different classes of employees at the same institution. Its officers



are convinced that even if the company took the attitude of offering what the customer desires and this resulted in a variety of contracts at a single institution, this would be confusing and otherwise unsatisfactory to all concerned. Its point of view is to welcome suggestions, and to consider and discuss them carefully, and then to be guided in its decisions, not by a desire to increase its "business" by pleasing all, but rather by determination to offer what it conceives to be for the best interests of higher education. It will continue to present its views of the fundamentals in this field, always welcoming discussion in the hope of improvement.

Space does not permit detailed discussion of many of the problems that may arise in providing retirement income for non-academic employees at the larger institutions and only mention has been made of the related question of survivors' benefits. TIAA welcomes discussion of problems of cooperating institutions even though it may develop that the solutions should involve a mechanism wholly independent of TIAA contracts. Sound principles are essential for the best interests of institutions of higher education, regardless of where they may lead as to administrative methods.

#### SUMMARY

Preceding pages have undertaken to discuss questions that must be faced by college officers in planning for retirement income of non-academic employees. The need for such planning grows out of the popular conviction that retirement benefits must be provided and the exception of employment for educational institutions from the coverage of the Social Security Act. Difficulties center principally about the high turnover in employment, the relatively low wages of non-academic employees, and the consequent meagerness of retirement equities that accrue in large numbers of cases during employment for a particular institution.

If these pages have value, perhaps it is in leading others to give thought to these questions rather than in any firm conclusions to which our study may lead. It is pretty clear that the needs for which benefit plans are arranged are very much the same with respect to all kinds of employees. They center about



the predicament of the family when the income of the breadwinner ceases and, rather obviously, this is very largely independent of the nature of the breadwinner's work.

The fundamental difference in the various plans that are apt to be considered lies in the benefit, if any, provided for the employee who withdraws before retirement. Because of the nuisance of small equities and the cost of their provision for large numbers who have only a passing connection with the institution, the temptation is to ignore the social aspect of the problem and provide no withdrawal benefit, unless it be after long service. And yet the institution must face two stubborn facts that bear on its public relations position as an institution of higher education, presumably furnishing leadership in the solution of social problems, and, certainly, interested in illustrating by its own dealings what its professors of employment relations must teach their students in their efforts to raise our general living standards:

(1) In its treatment of employees, an institution must not lay itself open to a charge of being less considerate of its lower-paid employees than of others.

(2) An educational institution must bring itself to the standards in employer-employee relations that our national laws require of industrial employers.

Hence we are led to the suggestion that smaller institutions had better make no distinction between different kinds of employees so far as planning for retirement benefits is concerned. And, regardless of size, an educational institution should keep clearly in mind that, within a very broad industrial coverage, withdrawal from service of a particular employer has no effect on the employee's benefit expectation; educational institutions should therefore be cautious about how the withdrawal benefits of their retirement plans compare in kind with those of the social security coverage.

## MILLIVOLT LEARNING

CHARLES E. PACKARD

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF BIOLOGY, ALFRED UNIVERSITY

A COLLEGE president of excellent standing is credited with the statement that there is no teaching but only learning. Probably this is an extreme point of view with which many would not agree fully. At least it hammers the keyboard hard enough to set a few tones in sympathetic vibration for those who have been trying to emphasize student responsibility in educative technique. A forward-looking weekly journal is on my desk. In it is an article by an able minister and church worker who quotes a reporter as having said to him a few days previously, "We educate so as to crush out everything that is native." Is it as utterly hopeless as that?

Statements which I made some time ago laid me open to the suspicion of being ultraconservative in teaching disciplines. Such is not the case, however. I am an experimentalist at heart and always have been quite willing to give up the traditional for something demonstrated to be more acceptable, or even going so far as to wish to blaze the trail in the expectation of a successful journey's end.

Feeling dissatisfaction with results as I had achieved them previously in a given direction I decided to adopt some mildly revolutionary expedients which I hoped might be productive of improvement in the conduct of a small class of advanced students in a particular course. No restrictions had been placed upon me and I felt conscious of the sympathetic approval of associates and administrative officers whom I knew to be eager for quality in student instruction.

The experiment, carried through an entire academic year, can hardly be said to have proved its full worth in one trial. Some results are indicated, however. In the mixed group which was chosen there were students whose records ranged from Phi Beta Kappa grades to those below average. Noticeable improvement was shown by one whose scholastic achievement in a previous course was indifferent, to say the least. Two who began the work discontinued it later, leaving college. All of the eleven who remained were seniors in good standing.

From the beginning a minimum of rule-by-thumb procedure with a maximum of student initiative and development were planned for. The course lent itself admirably to unification of the biological and physical sciences with much emphasis upon background. In other words it was a field in which certain working tools as factual concepts with which the student was supposedly already equipped might be brought into excellent application and use.

The lecture and laboratory work could be very closely correlated, so much so that part of the time allotted to one was often used in the interests of the other, it having been possible to do this for the hours ran consecutively. Because of schedule conflicts primarily, but also because of the excessive amount of varied materials and equipment necessary, the group was split into two laboratory divisions thus making a very limited number in each with which to work. The advantages in having a small room given over entirely to not more than eight persons at any one time are clear, particularly when that work was of the nature of individual investigation supplemented by wide reading in selected texts and sourcebooks.

A prime motive, also considered from the first, was the encouragement of student interest and application of available exercises to special tastes and requirements. There was kept in mind constantly the element of choice and opportunity for using judgment. Compulsion was discreetly subjugated, possibly too much so, for seniors even do not entirely throw off childish ways. It was the cherished opinion that by promoting a sense of freedom under reasonably asserted and controlled direction, believed to be basically intelligent, that responsibility would be the outcome. In this way a slight bridging of the gap between college pursuits and professional duties could be accomplished. Though difficult to detect I rather think this was obtained.

The course was outlined according to units<sup>1</sup> each of which kept the other sections in prospect and retrospect. Interrelationship was so evident that it was necessary to consider overlapping carefully at all times. This, however, had the distinct advantage of unification and recall. In a sense the student would be unfitted

<sup>1</sup> Cf. "Elementary Course in General Physiology" by Scarth and Lloyd for an excellent model.

for pursuing Unit One for example without knowing something of the nature of all the other units. Facts were cumulative and, of course, progressively revealing. No occasion was lost whereby this aspect could be brought out. Unit One was fully appreciated therefore only when the last unit was actually done.

Emphasis was placed upon continuity and interlocking in another direction because biological relations followed after consideration of purely physicochemical laws and principles. Processes as they worked out *in vitro* were related to happenings *in vivo*. In this way students had to draw upon the factual content of earlier biological courses as well as refresh their minds concerning laws and theories of chemistry and physics.

Attempt was made to convey a dynamic impression; to show that the phenomena encountered were still in evolution and flux, had not been and could not be entirely dogmatized upon, or earmarked and pigeonholed for reference forever. Naturally this led to some confusion. The utter lack of dogmatism sometimes causes a feeling of bewilderment and uncertainty, an idea that there is nothing which can be definitely settled.

Do we gain or lose by impressing upon youthful minds chaos as well as orderliness, change as well as permanence? I believe it is wise to show that many activities, living or non-living, are not completely understood nor chiseled into perfection, that most branches of learning do not deal with closed subjects in which there is nothing more to learn. Perhaps the elementary student should not be troubled by the puzzle of having half a dozen eminent researchers accumulate evidence which fits into a strong assumption for as many particular beliefs. The senior *should* be allowed to drift around a bit and pick his way through the dangers of uncharted seas of scientific, though friendly, feudal argumentation.

One unit was especially adapted to treatment by means of assigned projects and individual pieces of investigation. The results from this survey went far beyond expectation in arousing enthusiasm, critical ability, and a proper appreciation of what is actually entailed in *bona fide* research. It was required that the exercise of several weeks' duration, coming as a sort of climax at the end of the semester and after certain groundwork had been laid, be written up in the form of a scientific paper with models

furnished for guidance. Introduction, materials and methods, discussion, summary and bibliography were notable features of the papers. The original contributions made, industry, and specific methods shown in handling the problems were most pleasing. The work was taken so seriously that the instructor was criticized for not allowing more time.

In the very beginning arrangements were made to have a reference shelf of selected readings constantly on hand in the laboratory. These were used so freely that the instructor's own property showed the effects of wear and tear, which came naturally from legitimate usage and not careless treatment, however. From time to time students were asked to compile their own bibliographies after which exercise groups compared notes and commented on respective merits, with appreciation deepened concerning all that is involved in a body of authentic literature. A tendency to resort to the library for additional titles and to improve upon lists provided was most encouraging.

The field of available contributions seemed to be fairly well known to the class at the end. An increasing consciousness of its possibilities and limitations was clearly evident. There was lack of discrimination on important points, however, indicating that certain objectives which it was hoped would be worked out independently were not fully met.

A half hour's reading of any text or paper treating the unit under consideration was required at the beginning of the study merely for the sake of orientation and introduction. Automatically, the habit of performing the duty became firmly implanted so that no suggestion was needed to ensure its being done. In the latter part of the course whenever a new reading list appeared there was instinctive gravitation to the book-shelf for the preliminary preparation, recognized for its worth and not as a disciplinary rule to be followed because it was ordered.

An objectionable tendency to talk shop about other matters persisted, sometimes relative to lectures from which the students had just come, more often having to do with fraternity rushing, athletic contests or campus activities of different kinds. Rather heated discussions, nevertheless, occurred from time to time pertaining to moot questions and debatable points, the argument leading finally to the instructor for arbitration or authoritative



settlement, not always forthcoming for good and sufficient reasons! More or less fooling and joshing was evident in the mixed group. This was less apparent in the first semester. Schedule changes made rearrangement of the personnel in the divisions necessary thus bringing together some who would have been better off if kept apart. People do make a difference!

Many more details could be suggested. A great number of chemicals in various concentrations had to be mixed and prepared. More and more the students were accustomed to the job of handling the materials and compounding what they had to use. Habits of accuracy in minute matters, attention to skillful manipulation, and fulfillment of exacting conditions were emphasized in one way or another. Ends that were visualized at the outset were not, of course, perfectly met. Far from it. But broad lines were laid down for future amplification and reorganization.

More could doubtless have been done by way of individual conferences and personal suggestions though there was contact along this line. A course evaluation by each member of the class was required as a finishing touch with major emphasis on their ideas of the quantity and quality of the work, its interest for them as well as its practicality. Informal, oral reviews of the entire content by nature of a comprehensive examination were consummated with pleasing outcome. The discussion was prolonged at the request of the student, something one does not often encounter! I have long felt that the apparently inborn dread and detestation of a final is quite unnecessary, a condition for which the examiner is to blame rather than the examinee. Assimilation and correlation proved to be good. Can it be possible that arrested attention and interest had anything to do with it instead of forced feeding?

As looked upon now the method warrants continuance. There is little that is unprecedented about it. Perhaps it is a bit more unusual and socialized than traditional, run-of-the-mine formulae have called for. Whether there will be more of permanent gain from the associations and routines achieved by this as compared with more conventional methods cannot be predicted. A given teacher has a boy or a girl too short a time as a rule to know whether he has made a lasting impression upon the consciousness with what he has to offer.



Habits are built up over long periods. We receive those we are expected to train very late in their learning experience, possibly too late to remould their already well-formed patterns of doing things systematically and thoroughly, exactly and analytically, or the inverse. I cannot believe, however, that every classroom leader succeeds, even in a small way, in crushing out of young men and women all that is native. There must be something of good which we arouse in the beginning that is too hardy to fail to endure, something bound to be nurtured by the right sort of care so that it will develop and be perpetuated.

I am further convinced that we can improve in our approaches for all that. Up to this time there has been much waste motion, much ineffectual effort which might well be corrected. The voltage can be stepped up without fear of electrocuting the patient. It is likely that in numerous instances the current has been too feeble. Few of us are so able that we reach envious attainments every time we complete a year of instruction. As a result of our own imperfections and, may it be said humbly, indifference on occasion, perhaps there has been too much of what I am pleased to term millivolt learning.

## THE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT IN COURT

M. M. CHAMBERS

**T**HE period of World War II saw at least half a dozen litigated controversies concerning university presidents adjudicated in the higher courts. The facts and the judicial opinions clarify somewhat the position of the president, and yield some clues to improved legislation and administration for higher education.

### THE STATE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT IN A FEDERAL JOB

When Clarence A. Dykstra, then president of the University of Wisconsin, accepted appointment as Administrator of the National Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, he did so with the concurrence of the board of regents of the university, and with the understanding that he would pay the university the amount of his federal salary less expenses, and continue to draw his regular pay as president of the university. Thereafter the state treasurer refused to honor warrants for the president's salary until he was compelled to do so by *mandamus*. The clause of the Wisconsin constitution on which he relied declares: "No member of Congress, nor any person holding any office of profit or trust under the United States (postmasters excepted) . . . shall be eligible to any office of trust, profit or honor in this state."

The supreme court of Wisconsin held that the president of the state university is a public employee, but not a public officer of the state. Examination of the pertinent statutes showed that all the president's acts of authority are subject to approval by the board of regents, and that the board may remove him at any time without stating specific cause. Noting the apparent disparity between the statutory definition of the president's position and powers on the one hand, and his actual influence and prestige on the other, the court remarked: "Despite these limitations he is in fact the executive and directing head of the institution. The position is one of great power and influence because as a rule it is filled by men highly trained and very able." The board of regents is the legal repository of responsibility and authority for the university; and the president, being an employee of the board with all his acts and even his tenure subject

to its will, is not a public officer of the state within the meaning of the constitution. Hence his holding a federal office was not constitutionally incompatible with his position.<sup>1</sup>

#### SALARIES IN KENTUCKY STATE INSTITUTIONS

Section 246 of the constitution of Kentucky stipulates that "No public officer, except the governor, shall receive more than five thousand dollars per annum as compensation for official services. . . ." In a suit to determine whether this section was applicable to the president of the University of Kentucky and certain professors at the same institution and the president of the Murray State Teachers College, the highest court of the state held that these persons were public employees, not public officers; but were nevertheless within the meaning of the section, because "the public treasury would not be protected by limiting the salaries paid to the few officers of the state unless the salaries of the many employees were likewise limited . . . the word 'officers' must be construed to include, by inference, employees subordinate thereto."

Justice Rees entered a vigorous dissent: "The president and professors of the University of Kentucky and other state-supported schools are not officers within the meaning of the section, and its limitations should not be applied to them. . . . Today states and their subdivisions engage in manifold activities of which the most far-sighted statesmen of fifty years ago had not the slightest conception. . . . They intended the section to apply to public officers performing the customary executive, legislative, and judicial functions of government. So long as the section remains in the Constitution it should be strictly enforced, but it should be confined to public officers performing official duties, and we should not declare at this late day for the first time that it was intended to include employees. In construing a constitutional provision courts are limited to the language used and are controlled by what the framers of the instrument said and not by what they might have meant to say. . . . I think Section 246 should be construed to mean exactly what it says, and should not be extended beyond the clear implication of the language employed."

<sup>1</sup> *Martin, Attorney General, v. Smith, State Treasurer* (Wis.), 1 N. W. 2d 163 (1941).

The majority of the court went to some length to distinguish independent contractors from officers or employees of the state, and concluded that certain attorneys employed on a contingent fee basis in the assessment and collection of delinquent taxes, as well as a technical adviser on public utility rates, were not within the meaning of the section because they were independent contractors responsible only for results and not subject to detailed administrative direction. In contrast, the university president and professors were subject to the direction of the governing board as to the manner of their performance.<sup>2</sup>

The impracticability of limiting a state university president's salary, or those of the principal professors, to \$5,000 a year, has compelled the exercise of ingenuity to find some means of lawfully providing appropriate compensation. For a time that portion of salaries in excess of \$5,000 was paid from the earnings of the Haggin Trust, a private donation to the university with income expendable at the discretion of the board of trustees. More recently the necessary amounts have been given to the university annually by the Keeneland Association, a private non-profit corporation.

#### AUTHORITY OF BOARD TO ACT REGARDING PRESIDENT

When the president of the Rhode Island State College had reason to believe that he might not be reappointed at the expiration of his current term, or that he might be sooner discharged, he sought relief in the form of injunction to restrain the governing board from "any official action with reference to the college as far as it may affect complainant, from interfering with him as president of the college and with his office and home, and from uttering defamatory statements about him in his capacity as president." He alleged that two of the seven members of the board were disqualified by reason of concurrent holding of other public offices, as prohibited in the statutes.

The board answered with a demurrer, which was sustained by the state supreme court, and the case was dismissed without trial because the complaint was adjudged defective and insufficient. "For aught that appears, it may be that his appointment has

<sup>2</sup> *Talbott, Commissioner of Finance, v. Public Service Commissioner et al.* (Ky.), 163 S. W. (2d) 33 (1942).

expired, or that he was appointed originally to serve at the pleasure of the board, or that he was not duly and legally appointed. A specific allegation of the nature and terms of his employment, whether by appointment to an office or by private contract, which must necessarily be within his knowledge, would reasonably be expected of the complainant in order to enable the respondent board to make proper answer." As to the alleged disqualification of two members of the board, it was held that this was not subject to collateral inquiry and attack. Presumably it could be questioned only in a separate action in *quo warranto*. Thus on account of the lack of pleadings sufficiently complete to reach the legal issues concerned, the record of the case affords no exposition or determination of the issues.<sup>3</sup>

#### PRIVILEGED COMMUNICATIONS OF THE PRESIDENT

The University of Oklahoma medical school librarian was dismissed by the board of regents, whereupon she brought an action in damages for conspiracy against the president of the university and the dean of the medical school. She alleged that the defendants had conspired to secure her discharge, after she had served in the position seven years, by falsely informing the board that she had procured her appointment by misrepresenting her professional training and credentials. The defendants answered with a demurrer, contending that statements made to the board of regents were absolutely privileged. This view was sustained in the trial court and in the state supreme court on appeal: "The statements being absolutely privileged, it is immaterial as to whether they were made with improper motives or whether they were false. . . . Here the alleged slanderous statements were made at a session of the Board of Regents. . . . It has the final word in the employment or discharge of its faculty members and employees. . . . The Board must depend largely upon the president, deans, and department heads for correct information as to the fitness and qualifications of those on the payroll and those seeking employment. . . . The rule of absolute privilege in such a case is for the protection of the public and not for the protection of the officers."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup> *Bressler v. Board of Trustees of State Colleges* (R.I.), 21 A. 2d 559 (1941).

<sup>4</sup> *Hughes v. Bissell et al.* (Okla.), 117 P. 2d 763 (1941).

A somewhat similar and nearly contemporaneous case had arisen in the same state when the president of the Colored Agricultural and Normal University of Oklahoma at Langston was sued for slander by a former matron of one of the university dormitories. The president had told the board of regents at a regular session that he had been informed by a police officer that the matron had been arrested in Guthrie and charged with the crime of immoral conduct, committed with another employee of the university (the superintendent of buildings and grounds). The record showed that the board had previously instructed the president to report "any misconduct or irregularity on the part of any teacher or employee of the university." The supreme court held that the president had acted in the proper discharge of an official duty as defined in the Oklahoma statute covering privileged communications, and "absolute privilege attended the communication which he there made." Accordingly a judgment for the plaintiff in the trial court was reversed and remanded with direction to dismiss.<sup>5</sup> Two of the justices dissented.

#### RIGHTS OF LOCAL PROPERTY-OWNER AS AGAINST THE PRESIDENT

A rare case having unique aspects arose out of a peculiar local situation at Wilberforce University in Ohio, where a privately owned building and lot 30 by 150 feet in dimensions was entirely surrounded by the campus, and was in close proximity to the main entrance, the administration building, the library, dormitories, and other buildings of the university. The owner of the property complained that up to 1936 he had rented his building to a restaurateur, but for four years thereafter had been unable to rent it at all because the president of Wilberforce University maintained a standing threat to dismiss any student who patronized the place. He prayed for injunctive relief, and the trial court granted a permanent order enjoining the president from "interfering in any way with plaintiff in the rental or use of the property . . . so long as the person occupying the same is of good moral character and so long as no acts are permitted to take place therein that would in any way tend to lower the morals of any student of Wilberforce University." This was affirmed by

<sup>5</sup> *Sanford v. Howard*, 185 (Okla.), 660, 95 P. 2d 644 (1939).



the Court of Appeals, with the comment that it "does not prohibit any proper administrative rule or regulation affecting the conduct of students of Wilberforce University which is uniform in operation and is not directed especially against the plaintiff in the conduct of any business that may be established in the property described."<sup>6</sup>

The injunction was against the president personally and individually, and not against him in his official capacity or against the board of trustees. Apparently the court had reason to believe the plaintiff was entitled to relief from a species of anticipatory threat deriving from personal animus and not from the university authorities acting officially; and was careful to disclaim any interference with the lawful rule-making power of the university.

#### AUTHORITY OF THE PRESIDENT AS FISCAL AGENT

Just prior to the exposure of his criminal activities, J. M. Smith, president of Louisiana State University, confected a spurious resolution of the governing board purporting to authorize him to borrow \$100,000 on behalf of the university, and took it to the Hibernia National Bank in New Orleans. The bank gave him a cashier's check for that amount payable to the university. He took the check to the National Bank of Commerce in the same city (where the university had had certain deposits for some two years) and obtained that bank's stamp as guarantor of his own personal indorsement thereon. The check was then transmitted through the clearinghouse to the Hibernia Bank, which thereupon paid the amount to the Bank of Commerce, where it was deposited to the credit of the university. Smith immediately withdrew the sum by means of a cashier's check payable to a brokerage firm, and gave it to that firm in satisfaction of his personal indebtedness arising out of some concealed and ill-starred speculations in wheat. Within a few days he left the state, and when the transaction became known to the university authorities, they promptly denied any prior knowledge of it, and expressly disavowed any claim to the sum involved. Since a bank deposit made without the knowledge of the one to whom it is credited is not effective until he becomes aware of it and accepts

<sup>6</sup> *McGinnis v. Walker* (Ohio App.), 40 N. E. 2d 488 (1941).

it, the university was completely clear of the matter, never having been a party to it; and the only controversy was between the two banks as to which must sustain the loss. The Bank of Commerce, by reason of its guaranty of Smith's indorsement of the check, stood to lose; and a judgment was rendered for the full amount in favor of the Hibernia Bank.

There was proof that the university governing board had not authorized Smith to perform the transaction or any part of it; though there was evidence that on certain occasions the board had actually authorized him specially to borrow other specific sums under specified conditions. The main point is that as president he was without general authority to sign checks or notes binding the university by his own signature alone; and the fact that he had on some occasions received carefully defined special authorization only served to strengthen that premise.<sup>7</sup>

The foregoing cases serve to put some fresh paint on the signposts along the boundaries of the status and powers of the state university president. Within the scope of the authority and persuasion of these decisions, (1) he is not an officer of the state, but a public employee under contract with the university governing board; (2) his communications to his governing board related to the discharge of his official duties are absolutely privileged, and thus cannot be made the basis of a suit against him for libel, slander, or conspiracy; and (3) general authority to bind the university by his own signature on checks or notes is not inherent in his position.

<sup>7</sup> *Hibernia National Bank in New Orleans v. National Bank of Commerce in New Orleans*, 204 (La.), 777, 16 So. 2d 352 (1943).

## EDUCATION

WINSTON CHURCHILL

**I** HAVE enjoyed my stay in your genial sunshine and it has done me a lot of good. I am grateful for all the kindness and consideration with which you have treated a servant of the Allied cause in the fearful war we have won. The accounts I read of the severity of life in England and the darkening of the scene at home make me and my wife anxious to return there as soon as we can.

I am very glad to have an opportunity of expressing my thanks to Miami Beach, to Miami, to Florida and all this shining coast, for so easy and agreeable a wayside halt on the road we all have to tread.

This opportunity is afforded me in a manner most gratifying by the resolve of the University of Miami to give me a degree as Doctor of Laws. I regard this as a very high compliment indeed, and that I should receive the degree in the presence of this vast and gracious concourse makes the occasion memorable in my life.

I wish also, on behalf of my country, to thank the University of Miami for the wonderful help which they gave us in the late war by training cadets of the Royal Air Force before the United States became a belligerent. Upwards of twelve hundred cadets of the Royal Air Force received here a very high quality of technical, navigational and meteorological training. They flew five and one half million miles over Florida upon instructional courses, and the majority gave their lives for their country and for our common cause. It is a consolation to learn that they left so many pleasant memories behind them among the two thousand Miami households who received them with true American hospitality, and afterwards followed their fortunes and their fate almost as if they were the sons of the soil. Kindred hearts will beat in Britain on this account when they read of our ceremony here today.

I return to the degree which you have just conferred upon me. I am especially honored by the presence here of Doctor Guy E.

NOTE: Address delivered at the conferment of the Doctor of Laws degree by the University of Miami, February 26, 1946.

Snively, the Executive Director of the Association of American Colleges, and I thank him for the nice things he has said.

I am surprised that in my later life I should have become so experienced in taking degrees, when, as a schoolboy I was so bad at passing examinations. In fact one might almost say that no one ever passed so few examinations and received so many degrees. From this a superficial thinker might argue that the way to get the most degrees is to fail in the most examinations. This would however be a conclusion unedifying in the academic atmosphere in which I now preen myself, and I therefore hasten to draw another moral with which I am sure we shall all be in accord: namely, that no boy or girl should ever be disheartened by lack of success in his youth but should diligently and faithfully continue to persevere and make up for lost time. There at least is a sentiment in which I am sure the faculty and the public, the scholars and the dunces will all be cordially united.

This raises the interesting question of the age at which knowledge and learning may be most fruitfully acquired. Owing to the pressure of life and everyone having to earn his living, a university education of the great majority of those who enjoy that high privilege is usually acquired before twenty. These are great years for young people. The world of thought and history and the treasures of learning are laid open to them. They have the chance of broadening their minds, elevating their view and arming their moral convictions by all the resources that free and wealthy communities can bestow. It is the glory of the United States that her graduates of universities are numbered not by the million but by the ten million, and certainly any young man or woman who has these measureless advantages laid before him, and has not the mother wit to profit by them to the full, has no right to complain if he makes only a mediocre success of life.

Still, I am going to put in a plea for the late starters. Not only is the saying true, "It is never too late to mend," but university education may be even better appreciated by those in the early twenties than by those in the late teens. The attention which a mature mind can bring to a study of the philosophies, humanities and great literary monuments of the past is stronger and more intense than at an earlier age. The power of concentration, the retentiveness of the memory, the earnestness and zeal with which

conclusions are sought should, in most cases, be greater in the older students. This has a practical and a supreme application at the present time. Millions of young men have had their education interrupted by the war. Their lives have been slashed across by its flaming sword. We must make sure that, in both our countries, they do not suffer needlessly for this particular form of the sacrifice they have made.

I have been cheered and also, so far as my own country is concerned, spurred, by the tremendous efforts which are being made by all the educational bodies of the United States and by the American people generally to make up to these young men by all kinds of special arrangements and facilities what they may have lost by their services at the front. I have read that it is proposed to provide facilities almost immediately for upwards of fifteen hundred thousand young men, most of whom are coming home from the fighting lines and that in five years it is hoped that four millions may be provided for. This is indeed a splendid aim and effort.

I suppose, Mr. President, that you are making appropriate plans on a great scale to adapt conditions of university life to these "veterans," as you call them, though they are pretty young to earn such a title, or warriors anyhow, who come back, after fighting their country's battles in the air, on the oceans and on land from Okinawa and Iwo Jima to Normandy, the Siegfried Line and the Rhine. Men who have fought in action and led others or, by their example, inspired others, have had an education invaluable to the formation of character and the development of those qualities by which freedom and justice are preserved in strong nations. They must also be given the wider view, in outline at any rate, of the treasures which mankind has gathered in its long, checkered pilgrimage across the centuries. You do well to provide, as you are doing, on this prodigious scale for the baptism for such as are of riper years.

This is an age of machinery and specialization but I hope, none the less—indeed all the more—that the purely vocational aspect of university study will not be allowed to dominate all the attention of the returned service men. Engines were made for men, not men for engines. Mr. Gladstone said many years ago that it ought to be part of a man's religion to see that his country is well

governed. Knowledge of the past is the only foundation we have from which to peer into and try to measure the future. Expert knowledge, however indispensable, is no substitute for a generous and comprehending outlook upon the human story with all its sadness and with all its unquenchable hope.

May I not also advance the claims of literature and language. The great Bismarck—there were great Germans in those days—said at the close of his life, that the most important fact in the world was that the British and American people spoke the same language. Certainly we have a noble inheritance in literature. It would be an enormous waste and loss to us all if we did not respect, cherish and enjoy this magnificent estate, which has come down to us from the past and which not only unites us as no such great communities have ever been united before, but is also a powerful instrument whereby our conceptions of justice, of freedom, of fair play and good humor may make their contribution to the progress of mankind.



GREETINGS AT CONFERMENT OF DOCTOR OF LAWS  
DEGREE ON WINSTON CHURCHILL BY THE  
UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI,  
FEBRUARY 26, 1946

GUY E. SNAVELY

ELIZABETHAN ENGLAND produced its William Shakespeare, the England of one hundred and thirty years ago was saved from Napoleon's invasion by the Duke of Wellington, and in the England of the last half of the 18th century came into prominence the great painter, Thomas Gainsborough. In the England of our day and time there has emerged one with the conspicuous qualities of all three of these pre-eminent Britishers, their indomitable leader in her darkest hour, Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill. Encouraged by his cherubic smile and the ever flashing victory sign of open fingers, his loyal people followed him through their darkest Gethsemane of six years to joyous victory.

He can honestly admit he has "battled with his peers far on the ringing plains" of gusty debate in the House of Commons, in arguments on strategy with the greatest military geniuses of all times, and in physical danger on fields of mortal conflict. His buoyant spirit has ever found release and relief in communion with nature by the skillful handling of brush and palette when he could steal away for a moment's relaxation during the turmoil of a devastating World War. And now he has come from a lull in the turmoil of his parliamentary duties as leader of His Majesty's Loyal Opposition to the balmy breezes and cheerful sunshine of our Southland of palm and pine. Here there is no oppressive fog nor winter's sleet, snow nor ice, but is a spot fairer and lovelier than any paradise valley of Avalon whither the poet's fancy committed the spirit of Britain's earliest and most famed leader, King Arthur.

Speaking for the 612 member colleges and universities of the Association of American Colleges and their 1,500,000 students, I deem it a high privilege to bring greetings on this day of ceremonial recognition by one of our esteemed members, the University of Miami.

May I make bold to hope that our famous British friend will find time to visit many of our American colleges and universities, and by his inspiring presence and encouraging words fire our myriads of ambitious students to play aggressive roles in the struggle for a just and abiding peace. No one else could be so effective in this eerie Atomic Age.

## THE NAVY PLANS THE PEACETIME EDUCATION OF NAVAL OFFICERS

EDWARD V. STANFORD

RECTOR, AUGUSTINIAN COLLEGE

ON FEBRUARY 8th, 1946, Mr. Vinson, Chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, introduced into Congress a bill, known as H.R. 5426, which may have far-reaching implications for our youth and should, therefore, be of considerable interest to educators.

The legalistic terms of the bill itself make very difficult reading. Fortunately, all colleges have received a recent Navy pamphlet entitled "The Navy Plans the Peacetime Education of Naval Officers." This pamphlet presents in popular language the program which the proposed bill would make possible. It is a program which the writer feels is deserving of the enthusiastic support of educators generally.

In meeting the need of maintaining greatly augmented officer personnel to supply the relatively large peacetime fleets and shore establishments with a total enlisted strength of 500,000 men, the Navy had to choose between building one or more additional Naval Academies or working out a cooperative arrangement with the colleges. Having had very satisfactory results under wartime conditions with the product of both the prewar NROTC and the emergency college training programs, the Navy has wisely chosen to follow the latter course.

In the proposed program, the Navy has recognized the need of providing equal treatment and opportunity for those who will serve as officers in the peacetime Navy, whatever their origin may be. Since the Navy offers a fully subsidized program for its officer candidates who attend the Naval Academy, it is only right that it should offer a comparable program for those officer candidates who will attend civilian colleges. This the Navy now proposes to do under the authority which the Vinson Bill would grant.

Under such a program it would be possible in peacetime for young men irrespective of their financial resources to find a career in the regular Navy or Naval Reserve on the democratic basis of physical and intellectual competence.

It is proposed to select NROTC candidates through national competitive examinations within predetermined state quotas. The successful candidates would then be required to seek and obtain admission at one of the 52 universities or colleges where NROTC programs are established. When regularly enrolled at the college of their choice, the Navy would pay for tuition, fees and books, supply uniforms and also pay \$50.00 a month in lieu of board and room. Although not under military discipline or in uniform, except for weekly formations, these Navy students would rate as Midshipmen, USNR, during the four years of study in a civilian college. For the most part, they would choose their own courses at college and would be required to take only a minimum of specified subjects. At the completion of their four years of college they would receive commissions as Ensigns, USN, and would have the same status as do graduates of the Naval Academy. During the summer months, while at college, these NROTC students would probably go on active duty, either ashore or afloat. After completing their college course they would have the obligation to serve on active duty with the Navy for a minimum period of 15 months. Liberal bonus provisions would be offered if they elected to serve additional periods up to a total of 36 months. At the end of three years of active service the young Ensigns would be expected to make a decision as to whether they wished to remain in the Navy or to go on inactive duty in the reserve and thus return to civilian status. If they elected to remain in the Navy and were selected, they would be commissioned as Lieutenants, junior grade, USN, and would be given the same opportunities for advanced training, responsibilities and promotion as the graduates of the Naval Academy. If, however, they elected at the end of three years to return to civilian life, they would receive commissions as Lieutenants, j.g., in the Naval Reserve.

Naval aviation candidates would be handled somewhat differently from the candidates for NROTC. After graduation from high school, they would be selected on the basis of their peculiar fitness for aviation training and would be enlisted as Apprentice Seamen. They would be permitted to seek admittance to *any* accredited college of their choice and would attend there for two years. While at college their expenses would be paid by the Navy in the same way as for NROTC candidates. During the first summer they might be given some preliminary flight training. After completing two years in college they would be sent to a Naval Air Station for aviation training for one year and then would have two years of further service and training with the fleet. At the

Naval Air Station they would be considered as Midshipmen, USN, and would remain in this status for two years and then would be commissioned Ensigns, USN. When they had completed two years of duty with the fleet, they would have to decide whether they wished to make a career in the Navy or return to civilian status in the Naval Reserve. If they elected to stay in the Navy and were selected, they would be sent to the Naval Academy or other schools for two years of Naval education, otherwise they would go to a civilian college of their choice, presumably the college which they first attended, to complete their education at Navy expense and with the pay of Ensigns. At the end of these two years they would be commissioned Lieutenants, j.g., in the Naval Reserve and returned to civilian life. Those Ensigns who completed the two years at the Naval Academy would receive commissions as Lieutenants, j.g., USN. Up to 16½ per cent of the output may be commissioned in the Marine Corps.

In college parlance, this program would provide a substantial number of full scholarships to college for physically fit young men of intellectual ability, many of whom would never be able to afford a college education. What the total number in college at one time might be, is, at present, largely a matter of conjecture. The Congress has already fixed the peacetime strength of the NROTC at a figure not to exceed 14,000. This number will be distributed among 52 colleges and universities. Naval aviation candidates, however, who would be able to attend *any* accredited college of their choice might add 8,000 more to the total.

If the Vinson Bill is approved by the Congress, it will undoubtedly set the pattern for other branches of the Armed Forces and it would be safe to predict that many thousand additional scholarships would be available. It is known that the Army and the Army Air Force will both sponsor peacetime officer training programs in the colleges. The Army may be expected to almost double the present 127 ROTC colleges and the Air Force may add almost a hundred more. It may not be too rash to predict that the combined programs of the Armed Forces might, in effect, produce national scholarships for almost a hundred thousand young men. This would be, if verified, no inconsiderable contribution to the equalization of college educational opportunities for those economically underprivileged!

Although the Armed Forces do not necessarily think of their

problem in such terms, there is no reason why money to be spent for national defense should not also serve a desirable civilian end, if this can be done advantageously. That is why I believe that much can be said for the Vinson Bill, independently of its defense aspects. The program envisaged by the Vinson Bill should well-informed citizens. It is to be hoped that this interest will have a twofold interest not only for educators but also for all produce active support for the measure.



## REPORT OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON CHRISTIAN HIGHER EDUCATION

IRWIN J. LUBBERS  
PRESIDENT, HOPE COLLEGE

**B**EFORE the experimental atomic bomb was released in New Mexico, there was discussion of the possibility of its setting in motion a nuclear reaction whose limits could not be controlled. It would be salutary if the forces of Christian Higher Education could release spiritual energy which would shake us out of our complacency and set up, if not an endless chain reaction, at least a continuing "radioactivity" which would drive us all to greater diligence and more fundamental thinking and planning in our primary sphere of responsibility as Christian colleges. The National Commission on Christian Higher Education of this Association proposes to take the first step toward introducing a program commensurate with the spiritual challenge sounded by the arrival of the atomic age.

The nature of this program is dimly delineated in the experience of this Commission in its decade of existence as the Executive Committee of the National Conference of Church-Related Colleges, and during the past two years as the National Commission on Christian Higher Education of the Association of American Colleges. Our situation is analagous to that of the aged, colored gentleman who was asked how he had managed to accumulate such a great store of wisdom. His reply is enlightening. Said he, "I gets my wisdom from my good judgments, and I gets my good judgments from my experience, and I gets my experience from my bad judgments." Our failures point the course we take.

For years we have sought to command the time and talent needed to write a book that would adequately set forth the aims and purposes and programs of Christian Higher Education in America. Repeatedly we have appointed committees to devise ways and means of using the powerful agencies of the radio and motion pictures on behalf of our cause. For some time we have sought to formulate a plan for bringing creative spiritual stimu-

NOTE: Delivered at the Annual Meeting, January 9, 1946, Hotel Cleveland, Cleveland, Ohio.

lus to our faculties and students by means of campus visitors, after the pattern of the Arts Program. Since the advent of the peacetime universal military service agitation, we have endeavored to make our voice heard on the side of traditional Americanism. Our frustrations arise from the feebleness of our efforts. Thus far, we have traversed the two stages of "bad judgments" and "experience." The stages of "good judgments" and "wisdom" we trust lie directly ahead.

It is not the part of wisdom to give in detail an outline of the forward-looking program. Of this much I am convinced: the work of the Commission should be enlarged, an executive secretary should be employed on a full-time basis, with adequate office secretarial assistance; adequate financial support should be obtained, and the relation of the Commission to the Association should be clarified.

We all share a sense of high mission. We all stand ready to follow leadership that is devoted, intelligent and energetic. The specific elements of the program may not be clear, but the goal we all apprehend, without definition. Let us join forces on a road of high endeavor!

A traveler accosted a peasant in the field, with the question, "How far is it to Samarkand?" "I do not know," was the laconic reply. Again he questioned, "Is this the road to Samarkand?" "Oh yes!" was the pleasant response, "This is the road to Samarkand." Whereupon the traveler said, rather testily, "You do not know where Samarkand is and yet you say this road will lead me there." The peasant straightened his shoulders and with a sweep of his arm made answer, "How far it is to Samarkand, I cannot tell; but that this is the road to Samarkand, I know full well, for everyone who passes by says, 'I go to Samarkand.'"

Our record points the course we take  
To greater records we shall make,  
For hope springs not from what we've done,  
But from the work we've just begun.

## WELLESLEY'S NEW CURRICULUM

A NEW plan of curriculum at Wellesley College which entails changes in subject requirements, offers a different program for honors work, and suggests three ways in which undergraduates may make use of the summer vacation, has been announced by the college. This plan is the result of a three-year study made by the Faculty Committee on Long Term Educational Policy. During the three years the committee has considered suggestions for change made by members of the faculty, the alumnae, and the student body, and its report contains a thoughtful re-evaluation of a liberal arts program of education for women. Wellesley is the first of the women's colleges to have adopted by a unanimous vote of its faculty a revised curriculum after a prolonged study such as Harvard made in its report, "General Education in a Free Society."

The committee underlined in its report that women's colleges in general have not had as unrestricted a free elective system as many of the men's colleges. As a result, changes in the curriculum which would ensure a sound liberal education for all students—Harvard's notion of "general education"—have been easier to make within the framework of the curriculum as it already exists.

In a statement about the changes which have been made at Wellesley, President Mildred McAfee Horton said, "Women's colleges have been concerned for a long time with the problems of concentration and distribution. We, at Wellesley, have reaffirmed our faith in the general structure of a liberal arts training for women as it has been operating on our campus for many years. This new plan has succeeded in eliminating many of the restrictions and limitations which have interfered with our general program in the past. It allows for more emphasis on individual work in the future. We have tried to inaugurate not fixed courses but ordered courses for a student's intellectual growth. We hope that this will ease the tension of undergraduate life by allowing greater flexibility of requirements within a systematic framework."

Under the new plan all students shall be required to have a year of English composition, a year of Biblical history, a year of

literature (English or foreign), and a second course elected from the humanities group of studies, a year of history or philosophy, a year of either economics, political science or sociology, and a year of two different sciences. In this last group psychology is considered a science. The new requirements are no greater in number than they have been in past years but they are more specific in character. The literature requirement was planned so that all students would have an opportunity to enter into the thoughts and feelings of men of the greatest human achievement; history or philosophy in order to place emphasis upon the perspective and synthesis which these studies give; economics, political science or sociology because it is thought that all students should gain some knowledge of contemporary social institutions; and a laboratory science so that all may benefit from the experience gained in the laboratory.

Two new interdepartmental courses will be added to the curriculum: "Interpretations of Man in Western Literature" with texts chosen from the Greek, Roman, and early modern periods, and an "Introductory Course in Physical Science" which will introduce students to the fundamental concepts of both physics and chemistry. An "Introductory Course in Biology" which will stress the unity of all living things is being considered. These courses are not required but will be offered for free election.

An innovation in the Wellesley plan is that specific suggestions are made for the use of the summer vacation. In doing this the committee pointed out that students are students for twelve months of the year and not merely through term time, and that as students they should make more constructive use of vacation periods. Undergraduates will be encouraged to do field work, experiment with different kinds of summer jobs as a vocational training, and shall be responsible for serious and ordered reading. All students will have a list of recommended books regardless of their major study, and will have the opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge of these books either in ordinary class work or if they are honors students in their independent study.

Independent study and research will be stimulated by the new plan. Seniors and, in some departments, juniors will be permit-

ted to elect courses of independent reading, directed study, or field work. These courses, it is hoped, will lead more students to work for honors which have now been divided into two categories: Honors and High Honors. All students will be required to have seven full courses in their field of concentration. Those who work for honors will either choose a special subject for investigation, or will do independent work designed to strengthen their knowledge of and competence in their major subject.

## NATIONAL ROSTER OF PROSPECTIVE COLLEGE TEACHERS

**B**ELOW is given the list of seniors recommended by member colleges as persons who should be encouraged to do graduate work with the idea of preparation for college teaching. These nominations are made in conformity with the program approved by the Association at its annual meeting in January, 1945. Here are the chief features of the program:

Arrangements will be made by the candidate selected, in consultation with officers of his own college, to enter graduate school for at least one year's training for college teaching. His studies during this first year will be carried on primarily from the point of view of preparation for college teaching rather than of meeting the formal requirements for an advanced degree.

Each college will be concerned with helping those appointed find a practical solution of whatever financial problems may be involved.

Each college will undertake to offer each candidate it selects a one-year appointment to follow immediately after the year's graduate work. During this year the one appointed will be given opportunities for "in-service training" by serving either as an Assistant in the department of his special interest, thus coming in close contact with experienced teachers, or as an Instructor in charge of one or more classes under the supervision of a regular member of the department. Each college will determine the amount of compensation in each case, having in mind that the purpose of the arrangement is to provide opportunities for the one appointed and not to meet the institution's need for instructors.

At the end of this two-year period, as a result of his experience in graduate work and in the work of actual teaching, and with the help of his advisers, the student should be in a position to make a wise decision as to whether his life work should be in teaching, and if so, what type of further training he should undertake.

Quite a number of the member institutions sent word that they thoroughly approved of the program and hoped to be able to cooperate in future years, but this year's graduating class was so small that they were not able to make any nominations for the current year.



*Prospective College Teachers*

303

<i>State</i>	<i>Institution</i>	<i>Student</i>
ALABAMA	Judson College	Rosina Lincoln Adell Woodward
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	Dumbarton College of Holy Cross	Margarita Spencer
	Georgetown University	Joseph Crumlish
	Howard University	Norvel E. Carpenter Hilda Lucy
ILLINOIS	Rosary College	Audrey Smith
INDIANA	Manchester College	William R. Underhill
	Wabash College	Howard D. Miner, Jr.
LOUISIANA	Ursuline College	Joyce Dastugue Lillian Gambini Esther Redmann
MAINE	Bowdoin College	Reginald Ferguson Spurr
MARYLAND	College of Notre Dame	Margaret Mary McGorry Mary Dorothy McManus Bettianne Norton
	Loyola College	Robert E. Hiltz
MASSACHUSETTS	Regis College	Constance Carell Kathleen O'Connell Mary O'Sullivan
MINNESOTA	Macalester College	Harriet Johnson June Waller Paul Herzog
	College of St. Thomas	John Paul Gigrich
MISSOURI	William Jewell College	William Dale Maness Thomas Terry Luginbyl James Thomas Boswell
NEBRASKA	Nebraska Wesleyan University	Myrna Jones James A. Owen Henry H. Schloss Ivan R. Spealman
	York College	Laurence C. Smith Patricia L. Weidler
NEW YORK	Bard College	Kathryn L. Carlisle James M. Pines
	College of the City of New York	Mario M. Castracan Gladys Ehrenreich Alfred S. Goldfinger Wolfgang Rosenmeyer Joseph Silverman Alice Wexler
	Hartwick College	John Geiselmann Corrine Gordon Ralph Hoag
	Elmira College	Joyce Colburn Margaret Henderson
	Queens College	Anna Motto
	Skidmore College	Elizabeth H. Smith

OHIO	Defiance College	Donald F. Weber
OREGON	Lewis and Clark College	Forest Trubey
PENNSYLVANIA	Chestnut Hill College	Jane Burns
	Franklin and Marshall College	Richard Albert Goodling Robert Graeme Smith Richard Stonesifer
	Washington and Jefferson College	Fred W. Boyles Joseph W. Findley Bernard A. Staskiewicz
SOUTH CAROLINA	Coker College	Annie Chaworth Hayes Marjorie Huntley Jane Ann McGregor
TEXAS	Southwestern University	Helen Rebecca Tidwell
		Kathleen Alef Henley Mary Fay Richardson Jane Elizabeth Munson Glenis Galen Costin
VERMONT	Middlebury College	Cynthia Proud
VIRGINIA	Virginia Military Institute	James M. Morgan, Jr.
WASHINGTON	Seattle Pacific College	Sylvia Marie Ahnlund Mary J. Decker Donald M. Wagner
	Whitman College	William Ballard Roy Pierce
WEST VIRGINIA	Bethany College	Doris Gallagher William Young
WISCONSIN	Beloit College	Carol Jean Mather
	Milton College	Marjory Roeber

## NATIONAL INTERFRATERNITY CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ON COOPERATION WITH COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

**T**HE Executive Committee of the National Interfraternity Conference and the Conference as a whole, recognize the fundamental importance of proper and close cooperation between the fraternities and the colleges and universities on whose campuses they are permitted to operate. It is recognized that the best ideals of the college and of the fraternity cannot be achieved without such cooperation.

The Conference devotes much of its time to the constant stimulation of its member organizations to this end in matters scholastic, business and social. It is recognized that the proper adjustment of the fraternity to the prevailing spirit of the campus is necessary.

Standing and special committees of the Conference are charged with such matters as scholarship, housemothers, chapter house discussion groups, etc., in addition to the general Educational Advisory Council, and the Committee on Contact and Cooperation with Colleges and Universities.

The services of this last-named Committee have been offered to the members of the Association of American Colleges by letter addressed to the Executive Director. The Committee is anxious to serve in any matter relating to the mutual interests of the fraternities and the educational authorities.

A present activity of the Committee, now under way, is a country-wide study of administrative attitudes toward hazing and initiation practices in the colleges, as reported by the dean or the dean of men, based on the various actions of the N.I.C. in its annual conferences, condemning hazing and all initiations practices which involve any physical punishment or possibility of accident, or anything tending in any way to humiliate or degrade.

The N.I.C. official action is very definite, and is a recommendation adopted by the majority of the constituent group, consisting of graduate members and officers of the national organizations themselves. Many of the national fraternities have taken prohibitory action, and have communicated it to their chapters.

This immediate study is but one of the ways in which the N.I.C. Committee on Cooperation with Colleges and Universities is serving the educational world. Matters of scholarship, house management, etc., are detailed to other special committees.

The Committee has for its chairman President Gilbert W. Mead, Washington College, Chestertown, Md. Other members are Dean Fred H. Turner, University of Illinois, and Dr. Hubert M. Poteat, Wake Forest College.

## A SHORT HISTORY OF THE SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

JAMES R. MCCAIN

PRESIDENT, AGNES SCOTT COLLEGE

**T**HIS is the title of an article by Dr. Guy E. Snavely, Executive Director of the Association of American Colleges, in "The Southern Association Quarterly" for November, 1945. It is good news for those interested in southern education to know that it is to be reprinted and bound as a separate volume. It provides 125 pages of very interesting history.

Dr. Snavely is unusually well qualified. For eleven years he was Secretary-Treasurer of the Association, and for a total of more than twenty-five years he has been well acquainted with its work and with the educators who have participated in its activities.

The story which Dr. Snavely tells is taken partly from the records, but it is very much enlivened by personal recollections of the author and by informal personal comments on some of the events.

A valuable feature of the history is the presentation of lists of those who have been officials in the Association and another feature is the contrast between the earlier standards and the present ones.

The volume which is to be issued should have a good circulation throughout the south, and in many other parts of the United States.

## HIGH SCHOOLS FOR TOMORROW

### (Book Review)

HELEN M. HOSP

ASSOCIATE IN SECONDARY AND HIGHER EDUCATION,  
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN

*High Schools for Tomorrow*\* is a readable book. With Mr. Stiles' thesis that the high schools contain within themselves the seed of far-reaching improvement, accord can be expected. With all that the author says, however, there cannot be general agreement. In some matters Mr. Stiles' conclusions seem quite superficial.

On the basis of but a single year of teaching directly upon his graduation from college, can Mr. Stiles proclaim the unmarried woman teacher "the greatest weakness of the high school teaching profession"? It must have been a year of unfortunate and limited experiences indeed. From his more recent contacts with schools as a lecturer going merely to the auditorium for an assembly program and engaging in some incidental conversation during his visit, can he pass final judgment upon the actual classroom effectiveness and teacher-pupil relationships of the unmarried woman teacher?

One questions too the feasibility of Mr. Stiles' assertion that for the high school which he envisions the present teachers will not do at all. As a practical matter, one must work with the personnel one has. There are possibilities in in-service training.

The author charges that while in a single generation, American life has undergone a series of revolutions, the high school has remained relatively static. This reviewer agrees, in the main, but cannot forego pointing out to Mr. Stiles that somewhere he himself has failed to keep up with the "revolutions." Mr. Stiles advocates a salary distinction based on sex, the differential for men, of course! Otherwise, "society as a whole is the ultimate loser." Progressive voices in economic and social developments urge sex equality in employment and pay and in opportunities for advancement as a policy of national and international advantage

\* *High Schools for Tomorrow*, by Dan Stiles. Harper & Brothers Publishers, New York and London. 1946. 212 pp. \$2.50.



here and throughout the world. Artificial salary restrictions belong to a past age.

The school Mr. Stiles projects would reflect in miniature the typical life of communities: that is, have school activities such as a store, bank, restaurant conducted by students. A difference of opinion exists regarding this type of organization. There are those who advocate instead the community centered school where the students participate in the actual life of the community. This provides for desirable identification of the adolescent with the adult group through meeting real needs in real situations.

Mr. Stiles concurs with the recommendation of the Harvard Committee that all high school students be required to pursue a general course before specialization. Helpfully Mr. Stiles reduces the term "general education" to a group of goals and objectives. Keeping these goals in mind, "is more important by far," he says, "than the details of any curriculum."

The most significant recent development in high school education, Mr. Stiles believes, is the extension of the school day and year so as to allow the school increased influence in the student's life.

Mr. Stiles places the responsibility for improvement of the high school upon concerted community effort. He renders a service in setting this challenge to public-spirited citizens in his *High Schools for Tomorrow*.

## DEMOCRATIC EDUCATION

GILBERT W. MEAD

PRESIDENT, WASHINGTON COLLEGE

**DR. BENJAMIN FINE**, Education Editor of *The New York Times* sub-titles this book\* (on the wrapper, if not on the title-page) "A Report on the Colleges."

It is that, in so far as he summarizes what is being done, and what has been done historically, from the standpoint of a distinction between what he calls "aristocratic" education and "democratic." Dr. Fine feels that this is more than a distinction—actually a fundamental controversy.

Historically, the classical schools, developing from a European origin, "stressed the importance of books," while the other type of education, designated by Dr. Fine as "entirely American" arose in the colonies and the young republic. This, says the author, "stemmed from the hearts and minds of men who believed in the democratic concept of society, in the betterment of mankind through learning and enlightenment." The great landmarks of this idea are cited as Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, Horace Mann, and John Dewey, in chronological order.

A quick look at the early history of the American college system is followed by a short view of the growth of "democratic" education as the author conceives it; then a survey of typical institutions by class. On the right are the "aristocratic" wing, typified by Chicago and St. John's; "aristocratic" because they deny any educational privilege to any program other than sternly intellectual, and permit no taint of the vocational, pre-professional or utilitarian.

The "main stem" of traditional education comprises the great group from Harvard, Princeton, Yale and Dartmouth, across the country to Stanford, with several hundred other institutions, male, female, and co-educational; large and small; all with private or denominational control, and all with a background in arts and sciences, upon which have been added such familiar things as elective courses, pre-professional preparation and other factors beyond the "intellectual" as defined at Chicago or St. John's.

\* *Democratic Education*, by Benjamin Fine. Thomas Y. Crowell Co., New York, 251 pp. \$2.50.

Democratic education in practice is typified for the author by the land-grant colleges, the state colleges and universities whose logical aim is the covering of all the needs of all the citizens of the state.

The last classification made by the author is "on the extreme left in the college field," the experimental institutions "that feel the need for greater individual action." Such, of course, are Bennington, Black Mountain, Bard, Antioch, Sarah Lawrence.

In preparing for the return of veterans to college, it is evident that Dr. Fine knows from his experience in questioning what the veteran wants. Common experience with veterans country-wide supports his conclusion. The veteran wants an education from which he can draw a practical good as he sees it. The small percentage of them seeking the education of the "aristocratic intellect" type may be cared for in the small percentage of colleges devised on that plan. The great mass of them are not interested in such a program; wherefore it is incumbent on the rest of us to give them what they want, with the admixture of the more abstract ideals of the liberal arts still found in practically every college in the group defined as the "main-stem traditional."

A questioning of parents and of high school students arrives at a similar end. In the light of all his study Dr. Fine reaches the conclusion that the real American ideal requires higher education for all, with the colleges reviewing their program and putting forward one which will permit more high school students (if competent) to attend.

"The ideal college of the future," the author concludes, "will admit all students who desire to enter and who, within their limitations desire to work hard at making a success of themselves."

Many readers will find ground for argument in the author's thinking. There is no confusion as to his conclusions. He ends his study with a clear definition of "the democratic way" when he says, "Higher education for all becomes meaningful as the full responsibilities of the colleges to train men for better citizenship, to develop broader concepts of national and international attitudes, to improve the social and economic standards of the country are realized."

It is a stimulating volume in many ways.

## TOWARD IMPROVING PH.D. PROGRAMS\*

### (A Book Review)

WILLIAM ALLISON SHIMER

PRESIDENT, MARIETTA COLLEGE

**T**HE soaring enrolments of colleges and universities and the consequent scramble for additional teachers give timeliness to the study of Ph.D. programs prepared by Dr. Ernest V. Hollis for the Commission on Teacher Education, appointed by the American Council on Education. In a compact volume of 204 pages appears a comprehensive, discursive and statistical analysis.

The history of doctoral work in America is outlined from the time of Thomas Jefferson to 1945. The tables cover 22,509 living recipients of Ph.D.'s received between 1930 and 1940, showing where earned and where and how employed.

Criticisms of doctoral preparation are quoted from lay and academic employers and from the degree holders themselves. The author adds his suggestions for the improvement of doctoral work.

This study may contain no startling discoveries or recommendations, but it does bring together in well-organized form an adequate sampling of criticisms and suggestions. All interested in doing something to reduce dissatisfaction on the part of both graduate students and their employers would do well to read this study. Then they can feel fairly certain that they have taken all considerations into account. These data and comments will undoubtedly start many lines of thought and discussion adaptable to any institution.

The general burden of the argument is that the employers tend to disagree with many graduate faculty members as to the desirable nature of doctoral preparation. Faculties still emphasize specialized, original scholarship, whereas employers insist also upon the development of personal qualities desirable in colleagues, teachers and molders of public relations.

The expression, thinking "has so much physiology and sociology in it" that the whole person must be the object of graduate education, occurs on page 35 and again on page 190. This repeti-

\* *Toward Improving Ph.D. Programs* by Ernest V. Hollis. The American Council on Education, Washington, D. C., 1945.

tion emphasizes what the author admits as his fundamental assumptions that influenced the study. These are that the graduate school of arts and sciences should enrich "all vital aspects of scholarly preparation" rather than research alone, and that graduate faculties should accept responsibility for personality traits and general abilities.

The consensus of opinion sampled is that doctoral candidates are not prepared for "rich personal and social living." Three qualities are demanded: facility in logical thought, appreciation of the relation of one's special field to knowledge in general, and ability to express ideas—such a specialist as Nicholas Murray Butler described as a "broad man sharpened to a point."

One of the most interesting parts of the study is the chapter on suggestions from lay employers. There is general agreement that the industrial research expert is not an isolated specialist but "must qualify as a human being and be alert to everyday social existence, if he is to succeed." "Cooperativeness and sympathetic insight are stressed as much as intellectual integrity and skill in scientific techniques."

In keeping with this principle, the doctoral dissertation would seek not so much an "original contribution to existing knowledge" as "a variety in research methods and skill in critical appraisal." The dissertation, however, would be retained as "the heart of doctoral training" (page 193)—or rather "*education* as distinguished from *training*" (page 34).

A general criticism of much doctoral administration is that it merely continues undergraduate procedures and attitudes. The recipients of the Ph.D., like those of the A.B., frequently find themselves in positions little related to their fields of special study. Of 7,394 Ph.D.'s, for instance, 228 were in strange positions. Eligible to be addressed as Doctor were a village postmaster, a rental agent, a laundry manager, a florist, a police-court judge, and WPA clerical workers.

Dr. Hollis has rendered a service not only to the graduate schools but to the colleges and corporations that employ their graduates—and to the satisfactions the graduates themselves derive from life. Now the graduate professors can see themselves as others see them. Let us hope they have not taught so long they are unable to learn.

## AMONG THE COLLEGES

**BOSTON UNIVERSITY** celebrated the twentieth anniversary of the presidency of Daniel L. Marsh on January 31, 1946, with a dinner in his honor attended by 1,000 persons who had given \$100 or more to the current Building Fund Program. The announcement in our March BULLETIN was in error concerning the number present.

**BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY** announced a gift of \$200,000 towards the building of a new library. This gift, plus previously announced gifts of \$175,000, brings the university's library fund to \$375,000. It is estimated that \$500,000 will be needed for the building, which is to be Bucknell's first postwar building project.

**MONMOUTH COLLEGE** and **STERLING COLLEGE** have received from Mrs W. E. Gordon, ninety-one-year-old pioneer teacher in the public schools of Kansas, the deeds to 4960 acres of Kansas wheat land. The property is valued at \$180,000 or \$200,000 and is to be divided equally between the two colleges. Mrs. Gordon retains the income from the property during her lifetime.

**MORRIS HARVEY COLLEGE** announces that \$841,671 has been raised in a campaign for funds to build the first unit of its new educational plant.

**PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGE FOR WOMEN** broke ground around April 1 for a new \$200,000 dormitory unit, one of the first postwar college buildings to be erected. The new building will provide living quarters for 94 students and will be ready for occupancy in September.

**QUEENS COLLEGE** was presented by W. Henry Belk, Charlotte, North Carolina, merchant, property on which he and his business associates will erect a chapel costing \$150,000.

**ST. LAWRENCE UNIVERSITY** received a bequest of \$50,000 for a women's dormitory under terms of the will of the late



Miss Cora Dean of Gouverneur, New York. The university also will share in the residue of the estate after bequests totaling \$135,000 are paid.

**SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY** was the recipient of two more donations amounting to \$1,650,000. Mrs. W. W. Fondren gave \$1,000,000 for the construction of a natural sciences building, and Mr. and Mrs. J. J. Perkins gave an additional \$650,000 for the Perkins School of Theology.

**UNION COLLEGE** (New York) announces that fifty high school chemistry and physics teachers, selected from ten northeastern states, will be appointed to all-expense General Electric Science fellowships this summer.

**VASSAR COLLEGE** is to receive about \$460,000 under the will of Mrs. Louise Karçher Leopold.

**WAGNER COLLEGE** has announced the establishment of fourteen new scholarships worth \$6,000 annually.

**WASHINGTON COLLEGE** will receive approximately \$75,000 from the Harley estate.

**WEST VIRGINIA WESLEYAN COLLEGE** by the terms of the will of George W. Loar will be the recipient of \$15,000 to "train male students to become ministers in the Methodist Church."

### NEW COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

East Carolina Teachers College, Greenville, North Carolina. Everett Spikes, superintendent of schools, Burlington, North Carolina.

State Teachers College, Farmville, Virginia. Dabney S. Lancaster, superintendent of education, Richmond, Virginia.

State Teachers College, Mankato, Minnesota. C. L. Crawford, superintendent of schools, Council Bluffs, Iowa.

State Teachers College, Potsdam, New York. Frederick W. Crumb, principal of schools in central New York.

University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware. William S. Carlson, dean, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

University of Washington, Seattle, Washington. Raymond B. Allen, dean, College of Medicine, University of Illinois, Urbana.

Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, New York. Sarah G. Blanding, dean, home economics, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.

Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Virginia. Richard Jacquelin Marshall, chief of staff of United States Army forces in the Pacific.

Wells College, Aurora, New York. Richard L. Greene, professor of English, University of Rochester, New York.

Westminster College, New Wilmington, Pennsylvania. Henry Lloyd Cleland, director of personnel for Pittsburgh public schools.